

---

This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google<sup>TM</sup> books

<http://books.google.com>







*State  
University  
of Iowa  
Libraries*

---

BV823  
H47  
Y.2

# Date Due

<del>10 Jan '65</del>	<del>JAN 4 9 1997</del>
<del>3 Feb '67</del>	
<del>DESK</del>	
<del>10 Jan '67</del>	
<del>8 Mar '67</del>	
<del>DESK</del>	
<del>3 May '67</del>	
<del>20 Mar '70</del>	
<del>29 Jan '71</del>	

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

537

CAT. NO. 23233









THE LORD'S SUPPER:  
UNINSPIRED TEACHING.

Nihil est quod cogit in hoc corrigere sensum.

DUNS SCOTUS v. II. § 4, p. 589.

Si, ante tempora restitutionis omnium, Christi carnem non dicam oculis corporis videri, sed in terris alicubi esse constitui, contra prophetiam David, contra apostolum Petrum, contra co-apostolum ejus Paulum, contra Scripturas authenticas omnes facis.

BERENGARIUS, *de Sacra Cæna*, Lib. Posterior, p. 157.

Neither can we corporally receive what is bodily absent.

BISHOP HALL's *Olive Tree*, p. 289.

Christ would that we, touching the signs, should draw virtue from Him.

REV. H. SMITH, v. I. p. 43.

Corpus reductum ad indivisibilia non manet organicum.

TOSTATUS, v. x. Pt. II. p. 421.

# THE LORD'S SUPPER: 1/11

UNINSPIRED TEACHING.

THE SECOND VOLUME,

FROM

ALFRIC TO CANON LIDDON OF ST PAUL'S, LONDON.

(FROM A.D. 969 TO A.D. 1875.)

BY

CHARLES HEBERT, D.D.

OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, LATE VICAR OF AMBLESIDE.

SEELEY, JACKSON AND HALLIDAY,  
FLEET STREET, LONDON.

1879



**Cambridge :**

**PRINTED BY C. J. CLAY, M.A.  
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.**

BV823  
H47  
v. 2

# CONTENTS.

## THE TENTH CENTURY.

A. ALFRIC.	PAGE
His suffering is daily renewed at this supper through the mystery of the holy housel. Therefore we ought to consider diligently how that this holy housel is both Christ's body and the body of all faithful men after a ghostly sort . . . . .	4
If we behold the holy housel after the bodily understanding then we see that it is a creature corruptible and mutable. If we knowledge therein ghostly might, then understand we that life is therein, and that it giveth immortality to them that eat with belief . . . . .	4
There is one thing in it seen and another understood . . . . .	4
Truly it is Christ's body and blood, not bodily but ghostly . . . . .	4
 B. GERBERT, SYLVESTER II. POPE.	
Lo ! the flesh from the virgin under the sacrament for communicating flesh . . . . .	9
That He might unite us with His own body...the eucharist, which is received from the altar being the medium, mediate, and confirming it . . . . .	9

## THE ELEVENTH CENTURY.

A. PETER DAMIANI, BISHOP OF OSTIA.	
The priest in offering acts for the people, so that they all offer . . . . .	12
One body of Christ in all places, like the one Deity of the Word, as His people are one body . . . . .	12
A man is called a microcosm ; so each saint is a church in himself . . . . .	12
A bad man can receive Christ's body . . . . .	14
Opinions of Simonians perhaps a little exaggerated, since one part is Protestantism . . . . .	14
 B. LANFRANC, HEAD OF THE BEC SCHOOL AND PRIMATE OF ENGLAND.	
We believe it in the highest degree expedient for all of all ages, as well the dead as the living, to fortify themselves with, sese munire, the reception of the body and blood of the Lord. (Letter to Bishop Domnald, of Ireland.) And yet we do not believe in any degree, ullatenus, that if they happen to go from the chapel immediately after their baptism (and die) before they receive Christ's body and blood, that they on this account perish for ever. Otherwise the Truth would not be true. He that believeth and is baptized, &c. So Except ye eat, &c. As far as relates to eating with the mouth cannot be said generally regarding all . . . . .	16

	PAGE
The sacrament of the body of Christ, as far as it refers to that which was sacrificed on the cross, the Lord Christ Himself, is His flesh which we receive in the sacrament hidden, opertam, by the form of bread, and His blood which we drink under the appearance and taste of wine, &c. . . . .	18
Though his flesh, carnes, be truly eaten on earth and His blood truly drunken, yet in the time of restitution He continues to be entire and living at the Father's right hand . . . . .	18
On Ephes. v. 20, Because we are members of His body...having the same flesh and the same bones (i. e. of the same kind) as He Himself had . . . . .	20
<b>C. BERENGARIUS, HEAD OF THE TOURS SCHOOL AND ARCHDEACON OF ANGERS.</b>	
And that there is but one way out from all that figurative kind of speaking and no more, unum patere, non amplius, exitum . . . . .	26
Addressing Lanfranc, That Humbert of yours, saying, The bread placed on the altar is, after consecration, Christ's body, to be considered bread in the phrase that belongs to Christ's own, propria locutione, and is to be considered (or received) as Christ's body in a figurative phrase. That Humbert in this is contrary to himself I have affirmed and affirm still . . . . .	27
It was a most mad saying and the greatest reproach to the Christian religion, that Christ's body is (now) made of bread or of any thing whatever . . . . .	27
They that affirm that Christ's flesh is made afresh (now) either in part or as a whole by generation of the subject matter, and that He is present to the senses on the altar (the bread having been taken away by the corruption of the subject matter) are speaking against the authority of the eternal and unchangeable truth. This was maintained by the Franciscans. The Dominicans held ubiquitarianism : and this was the accepted opinion . . . . .	28
<b>D. FULBERT, THE TEACHER OF BERENGAR IN THE SCHOOL AT CHARTRES, OF WHICH PLACE HE BECAME BISHOP. DIED 1029.</b>	
That body of the Lord raised out of the dead and placed in Heaven dies now no more. That sacrament dies for us daily and daily rises again for us, appears and is eaten . . . . .	33
Christ bears the true sanctified bread here (on earth) named His body . . . . .	34
If He could create creatures out of nothing, much more may He be able to convert these very things into the dignity of a more excellent nature and transfuse, transfundere, into the substance of His own body . . . . .	34
Not curiously insist on finding out distinctions by man's disputations . . . . .	34
Therefore faith is before all things the summum bonum . . . . .	35
<b>E. HUMBERT, CARDINAL, ARCHBISHOP OF RHEIMS.</b>	
Cast away the unleavened bread in Lent and the keeping of Saturdays (Sabbatorum) to the wretched Jews. All things are made new to us, i. e. temples and altars, priests and sacrifices, candelabra, censers, food and drink, &c., so that all are old and not old...we duly venerating and retaining the veritable body, corpus veritatis, made out of unleavened bread and (sanctified) in it. For if you receive wine why reject unleavened bread? . . . . .	36
<b>F. JOHN, BISHOP OF AVRANCHES, AND THEN ARCHBISHOP OF ROUEN.</b>	
Sacerdos corpus Domini tripliciter dividat...populo...quem intincto pane permittitur communicare summâ necessitate timoris sanguinis Christi effusionis. Calicem ad mundandum et sumendum quod remansit. Vita eucharistiam non verba faciunt. Jerome . . . . .	40
<b>G. ANSELM, SUCCESSOR OF LANFRANC AT BEC AND IN THE PRIMACY OF ENGLAND.</b>	
I adore and venerate this Thy holy body and this Thy holy blood...By the virtue of these make me one of those 'many' (for whom the blood was shed) . . . . .	43

	PAGE
Absolve and free thy servants and maidens, me, and all that have confessed to me their sins, &c. . . . .	43
Hail Christ's body, born of the holy virgin, living flesh, entire Deity, true man . . . . .	44
And since Christ's (human) soul must be represented by something, nothing was found in all bodily things to be a nearer representation of it than blood, the seat of the soul . . . . .	49
According to the determinations of the fathers we must understand that the bread laid on the altar is by those solemn words changed into Christ's body, and that the substance of bread and wine does not remain, yet we must understand that there remain appearance, species, &c., <i>i.e.</i> form, colour and taste, &c. . . . .	50
According to the species, appearance, kind, &c., it can be received equally by the faithful and by the unfaithful . . . . .	51
<b>H. WALERAN OF NUREMBURG WRITING TO ANSELM AGAINST ALL VEILS IN THE RITE.</b>	
The Paschal victim, Christ, was sacrificed with His body naked on the altar of the cross. He who made known to His own all things that He heard from the Father willed that he should be offered with His body bare... We with Moses, as if we were Jews, put a veil upon Him . . . . .	52
<b>I. IVO, BISHOP OF CHARTRES.</b>	
A letter of Pope Soter, That incense be placed on the oblation of the Lord's body and blood . . . . .	53
<b>J. DURAND, BISHOP OF LAODICEA.</b>	
Calling up the King of France against Bruno and Berenger . . . . .	55
<b>K. GUITMUND, BISHOP OF AVERSA.</b>	
Ut una queque separata particula sit totum Christi corpus, et tamen omnes separatæ non plura corpora sed unum corpus . . . . .	57
Christ's body present in a latent way . . . . .	57
All portions, both joined together and separated . . . . .	57
<b>L. ALGERUS OF LIEGE.</b>	
Si impanatur Christus vel in panem convertitur, vel fit panis . . . . .	58
<b>M. THEOPHYLACT, ARCHBISHOP OF BULGARIA.</b>	
If it appeared flesh we should not be favourably disposed to partake of it . . . . .	60
For it is not flesh of a mere man that is being eaten, but of God, and able to make us Divine, as it has been mingled with Deity . . . . .	60
For there takes place a mingling, strange and beyond account, that God should be in us and we in Himself . . . . .	61
In the case of the old (covenant) Christ does not concede that the gift is greater than the altar; but in our case the altar is rather sanctified by the gifts: for the loaves are changed by a Divine grace into that very body of the Master: wherefore also the altar is sanctified by these . . . . .	62
On 1 Cor. x. 16, St Paul did not say partaking, <i>μεροχῆ</i> , but communion, that he might shew it to be something more, that is to say the high union. In partaking of it, the cup, we communicate, <i>i.e.</i> we are united with God . . . . .	64
<b>N. RUPERT, ABBOT OF DEUTZ, COLOGNE.</b>	
All clouds of figures and similitudes being removed, &c. . . . .	72
Let none think he has recovered life of body and soul <i>by faith only</i> without the visible food and drink of His body and blood . . . . .	72



The bread once consecrated never afterward loses the virtue of sanctification, or ceases to be Christ's body. But it does not profit an unworthy person at all, whose faith without works is dead, and therefore has not the Spirit who makes alive . . . . . 74

Bread brought near to and immersed in the terrible mystery of Christ's passion still seems to be the bread it was, and yet is in truth Christ, which it was not . . . . . 76

O. ST STEPHEN, THIRD CISTERCIAN ABBOT.

Let the deacons put the corporal on the altar....But let the Abbot carrying down the Lord's body with the vessel in which it is to the altar, place it next the corporal, &c. Let the abbot, after incense has been first used, then wash his fingers in an open vessel, and take out from the vessel the holy communion and place it on the corporal . . . . . 79

P. BRUNO, BISHOP OF SEGNI.

Quod qualiter fiat, Ipse solus novit qui omnia novit et potest . . . . . 81

## THE TWELFTH CENTURY.

A. PETER OF BLOIS, ARCHDEACON OF BATH, AND AFTERWARDS OF LONDON.

The bread and wine offered by Melchizedek were as it were sacraments of this sacrament . . . . . 84

B. GUIBERT, ABBOT OF ST MARY OF NOGENT IN COUCI.

But if this our Host, though the Lord has once suffered, be only a figure of Him that suffered, I do not know whether it can be any true good. But if it only exhibits a memorial to the eyes of the uneducated, or presents little or no aid to the wise, &c. . . . . 87

It is asked whether that body which is taken from the altar has the character (speciem) of the Lord as living or as dead? . . . . . 89

There is then nothing to be found in Christ mortal or capable of suffering, nothing but what is incorruptible and immortal, unless he willed to die . . . . . 90

C. HERVÉ, MONK OF BOURG, DEOLS, S.E. FRANCE.

He eateth and drinketh unworthily, that celebrates the mystery or that receives it otherwise than has been handed down by Christ . . . . . 91

D. HUGHES DE ST VICTOR.

Reasons why Christ gives Himself in an unseen manner . . . . . 93

A new difficulty . . . . . 94

E. GRATIAN'S DECREE. . . . . 94

F. HILDEBERT, ABBOT OF CLUNY.

Bread to be dipped in wine afresh for each communicant . . . . . 96

The mouth of the communicant to be first washed . . . . . 96

Christ's body exists imperceptible on the altar . . . . . 97

G. HONORIUS, MONK OF AUTUN IN BURGUNDY.

Christ the Pontiff of pontiffs puts incense of the cross upon the altar, because He intercedes with the Father for us . . . . . 97

Within the limits of the Catholic Church it is lawful to offer sacrifice, and outside it God accepts no sacrifice . . . . . 98

H. ABELARD, OF BRETAGNE.	PAGE
The cause of this sacrament (being instituted) is the remembering of the death and passion of Christ . . . . .	100
He appointed this sacrifice to take place in memory of Himself that we might through it have our love of Him increased . . . . .	100
This mutual love unites both Him to us and us to Him . . . . .	101
This body is the sacrament of that body of Christ, which is the church. But the sacrament of the blood is the Spirit of the church, which makes alive by sevenfold grace . . . . .	101
We do not read of the water, that Christ had added it to this sacrament . . . . .	101
By the receiving of this eucharist the devil is bound and tied back . . . . .	101
I. ST BERNARD, ABBOT OF CLAIRVAUX.	
Such is the force of the sacraments held on those days that they can themselves cut strong hearts and suffice to soften every breast though like iron . . . . .	104
A Lismore clergyman held that it gives "only sanctification, not the true body of Christ, non corporis veritatem." Life of St Malachi . . . . .	106
From the time he had not offered the living bread from Heaven for her . . . . .	108
J. GERROCH, ABBOT OF REICHENSPURG, IN HIGHER AUSTRIA.	
Christ Jesus, though in the body He remains in Heaven, is none the less in the body in His temple which is the church, which He feeds with His own body and blood, &c. . . . .	109
The true body taken from the virgin is on the altar made present, sacrificed and eaten, &c. . . . .	109
Folmar affirming that the Lord's body never since He ascended has come down under the heaven . . . . .	110
What holy church sees on the altar is not to be named the body of a man, as the heretic Nestorius, &c., but (only) the body of the Lord . . . . .	110
Anathema is he who thinks the Lord's living and life-giving body is circumscribed to a particular spot in Heaven, &c., so that it cannot at once and the same moment be in its totality in many places, &c. . . . .	110
K. PETER THE SINGER, OF PARIS.	
Augustine scarcely allowed a single mass every day . . . . .	112
We never read 1 Cor. xi. of a "mass" of two or three faces; but now it is tripled or made seven times; and the mysteries and order of the mass are thrown into confusion . . . . .	112
If as the Manichean says it is a representation of the body and nothing else . . . . .	113
L. PETER LOMBARD, BISHOP OF PARIS.	
By baptism we are made clean...By the eucharist we are consummated in good. Baptism extinguished the heats of vices, the eucharist refreshes us with spirituality . . . . .	114
These two sacraments were shewed when blood and water flowed from Christ's side . . . . .	115
It is to be undoubtedly held that the sacraments are received by the good, not sacramentally only, but also spiritually . . . . .	117
M. ALAN OF THE ISLANDS (LILLE), THE UNIVERSAL DOCTOR.	
Nothing of the bread remains, as relates to matter or substance, but only as to accidentals . . . . .	120
Some say that the accidents are not there...but appear to be . . . . .	121

Heretics ask if it be an article of the Christian faith that the bread is transubstantiated into Christ's body, since there is no mention of it in any creed. N.B. Above a century before the Fourth Lateran Council . . . 121

#### N. INNOCENT III.

Order of the Mass Prayer in a reverence to the middle of the altar. Receive, O holy Trinity, the offering of bread which we offer to thee on account of the memory of the passion, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus Christ our Lord, and to the honour of Mary ever virgin and blessed John Baptist and the holy apostles Peter and Paul, and of those saints and of all saints, that it may profit them to their honour but to us for salvation, &c., &c. . . 126

It is unfit, indignum, that hands that have handled the incorruptible body should touch a corruptible body till they be carefully washed, studioso . . . 128

The priest breaks the host that in breaking of bread we may know the Lord . . . . . 128

Three crosses are made on the cup's mouth because three women were seeking Him, when crucified, at the gate of the tomb . . . . . 128

The deacon removes the corporal, marking that the Lord's angel rolled down the stone from the gateway of the monument . . . . . 128

On corporals, why one part is extended and the other kept folded up. The part extended signifies faith; the part folded marks understanding . . . 130

So many and so great mysteries are involved that none untaught by unction is sufficient to unfold them . . . . . 131

#### O. THE TREATISE DE CENA DOMINI.

The bread carnal food, the body and blood spiritual . . . . . 133

What the Capernaïtes understood . . . . . 134

The logically necessary consequences . . . . . 134

Transubstantiation . . . . . 134

Drinking blood an entirely new doctrine . . . . . 135

### THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY.

#### A. THE DECREE OF THE FOURTH COUNCIL OF THE LATERAN, 1215.

The universal church of the faithful is one, outside which there is no salvation, and in it Jesus Christ Himself is the same Priest and Sacrifice to all; Whose body and blood, &c. Same words repeatedly used before . . . 136

#### B. FRANCIS OF ASSISI. HIS NAME WAS JOHN, BUT HIS FATHER'S FRENCH CUSTOMERS CHANGED IT.

From Rule I. Confess your faults one to another. Yet let them not on this account give up having recourse to priests, because the power of binding and loosing is conceded to them only. And thus contrite and (having) confessed let them take our Lord Jesus Christ's body and blood, with great humility and veneration, &c. . . . . 140

We know that the body cannot be, unless it be first sanctified by the word. For we neither have nor see anything of a bodily nature relating to the Highest One Himself, except body and blood . . . . . 141—2

They that...do not believe, &c., &c. are condemned . . . . . 141

His will says, I wish to honour priests as my lords, and I am loth to dwell upon, considerare, sin in them, because I see in them the Son of God and they are my lords, &c. . . . . 142

C. BENEDICTION OF THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT OF THE TERTIARIES.	PAGE
Rule from Ara Coeli for the sisters at Westminster . . . . .	143
D. ROGER BACON.	
Of the church among the Tartars. In the mass they consecrate one broad loaf, of the breadth of the palm of the hand, and divide it into twelve parts, according to the number of the apostles, and the priest gives to each one the body of Christ into his hand, &c. . . . .	145
E. ALEXANDER OF HALES, A FRANCISCAN AND OF GLOUCESTERSHIRE.	
He quotes Damianus' opinion that the bread is not still present, but that it passes in a way beyond nature into Christ's body and blood . . . .	148
Then in behalf of consubstantiation, it would be a truer sign. It would be more consistent for the bread in its own substance to be a sign than that only the sensible species of it should [Durand, of St Porcian, grapples with this difficulty] . . . . .	148
But his solution is, Bread (itself) in no way remains...such would be in opposition to the authority of the holy writers...one reason is that thus idolatry is avoided . . . . .	148
The conversion of it into Christ is not an augmentation of any thing, since the whole is changed into the whole . . . . .	149
F. BONAVENTURE (JOHN FIDANZA), CARDINAL, BIOGRAPHER OF S. FRANCIS.	
The letter (of the text in the Gospels) is in the wrong order, præpostera est, and ought to be thus put together, construi. He received bread and gave thanks, saying, This is My body, and He brake and gave . . . .	151
Note that there are four opinions, <i>i.e.</i> about the form of Christ's own consecration of the bread and wine: (1) That He made it, confecit, by the virtue of the Divinity without words; (2) that He first said the words to Himself, and afterwards openly, &c., &c. . . . .	151
But the taking of the flesh by the bread, assumptio, is understood to take place during the reception . . . . .	151
The church preserves the form (of language in the service) handed down by apostles in making (the body and blood) which also they received from Christ . . . . .	152
G. NICETAS OF COLOSSÆ, <i>i.e.</i> CHONIATES.	
That the bread and wine mystically ministered in sacred service in the Divine ceremonies is in truth the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, being changed by His Divine power conceivably and invisibly, in a way above natural thought, as He alone knows . . . . .	155
H. ALBERT THE GREAT, SON OF A GERMAN PRINCE.	
A sacrament is a grace upon grace, containing a heap as it were of graces, &c., &c. . . . .	156
Matt. xxvi. As if He says, The fulness of grace that is in the sacramental vessel of My body . . . . .	156
How this sacrament belongs in genus to sacrifices...It abundantly causes all that it is the sign of, and contains it in itself, by the grace of the body and the blood . . . . .	158
Four reasons are given by doctors why Christ gave His own body after other food . . . . .	158
Reasons for the churches ordaining the contrary, reverenter et salubriter . . . . .	158



<b>I. THOMAS OF ROCCA SECCA IN AQUINO, CALLED S. THOMAS AQUINAS.</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
This sacrament a threefold meaning, (1) in respect of the past, commemorative of the Lord's passion which was a true sacrifice; and with reference to this it is named a sacrifice [improperly]. (2) present church unity. (3)...future prefiguration of the fruition of God which we shall have in our patria, and with reference to this it is called viaticum...and eucharist.	
It is called a sacrament in so far as it represents Christ's passion . . .	161
Citation from John Damascene includes this, But they are called representations of the things to come, not as not being truly Christ's body and blood, but because now by them we partake of Christ's Godhead, but then perceptibly by sight only, <i>νοεῶς</i> [Improperly put] . . .	162
Whether there is any causative power in the sacraments [themselves]...a certain instrumental virtue [only] to bring grace to us or into us, ad inducendam,...as an instrument moved by the principal agent...by a kind of concomitance, &c. To them it is difficult to say how they understand them to work, ex operato, &c., &c. [The point of points. See the entire extracts] . . .	163
<b>J. WILLIAM DURAND, OF MENDE; HE STUDIED AND WROTE AT BOLOGNA, &amp;c.</b>	
After the loud utterance of the declaration there is secret silence, in which the canon of the mass is devoutly said, &c., because, according to S. Matthew xxvi., Christ was praying alone . . .	166
The priest of the law had His face to the propitiatory . . .	166
The priest in the mass kisses the altar three times . . .	167
When the priest then pronounces those words of Christ, and the bread and the wine are turned into the body and blood, by that virtue of the Word by which the Word was made flesh, &c., &c. . .	169
What he says on sprinkling I cannot set down in English here . . .	171
<b>K. DUNS SCOTUS. JOHN OF DUNSTAN, IN NORTHUMBERLAND.</b>	
Whether the sacraments of the new law have causative action in respect of grace....Sacraments do not contain really...they contain, virtualiter, in their virtue [special pleading] . . .	173
For if the sacraments of the new law do not give grace, except that [or because, quia] God gives grace to the recipients of them, then a sacrament does not by (its own) force justify...Therefore it seems that they make that grace which they confer [Monstrous] . . .	173
If the body of Christ can be in another place than where it is, in a mode not natural to itself, then it can be under a mode natural to itself. [Negotrumque] . . .	178
<b>L. NICEPHORUS BLEMIDAS.</b>	
To utter the words of the very sacred sacrifice, sacrosancto, which are splendid and beautiful as pearls . . .	179
<b>M. JOHN OF PARIS, TERMED BY HIS FOLLOWERS, FOR HIS ACUTENESS, PIQUE-ANE.</b>	
That the bread's substance remains under its own accidents, not in its own subject-matter, but drawn to the being and subject-matter of Christ, so that there is one subject-matter to the two natures . . .	181
Body is not corporeitas, but that which has corporeitas, because there is only one subject-matter there . . .	181
There is no communication of properties between Christ and the bread which He took . . .	182
<b>N. MARSILIUS OF PADUA.</b>	
Christ gave to the apostles power to transubstantiate . . .	185
Christ gave to them the power of the keys . . .	185
And power to transmit both these powers to others . . .	185
But only general councils to decide interdicts of the kingdoms of princes . . .	187

## THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY.

A.	NICOLAS DE LYRA, COMMENTATOR, BORN NEAR VERNEUIL.	PAGE
	John xviii. Passover is not put for the paschal lamb, but for the unleavened bread, used for the seven days, &c. . . . .	189
	He brake (the bread) to shew that the breaking of His body would not be without His own will, sponte . . . . .	190
	He did not break His own body, for it is not in the sacrament in a frangible mode, but he brake the species of the bread which were remaining . . . . .	191
	He accomplishes this sacred rite in the consecration of the material, but other sacraments are perfected during the use of the material . . . . .	191
B.	WILLIAM OF OCKHAM, OF MERTON COLL.	
	In quâ Ipse Idem est Sacerdos et Sacrificium . . . . .	193
	Transubstantiatis pane in corpus et vino in sanguinem . . . . .	193
	Ita quod substantia panis non maneat . . . . .	193
	Accidentia tantum . . . . .	193
C.	JOHN TAULER.	
	Ici Celui qui nourrit et la nourriture qu'il donne est tout un . . . . .	197
	En recevant le vrai Fils de Dieu Son vrai corps vivant et Divin, &c. &c. . . . .	198
D.	NICEPHORUS XANTHOPULUS.	
	'Απόρρεξαι καὶ τῷ πρεσβύτῃ κατὰ τοῦ στόματος ἐπιστᾶναι. . . . .	200
E.	JOHN DE WYCLIFF, OF LUTTERWORTH AND OXFORD.	
	It is not naturally the body of Christ . . . . .	201
	Can any thing be more contrary to another than the doctrine which affirms this sacrament to be sacramentally the body of Christ, and the... doctrine...that this sacrament cannot be in any sense the body of Christ? . . . . .	201
	It is merely a double meaning...in those who affirm that the sacrament is not naturally the body of Christ, but that this same sacrament is Christ's body figuratively . . . . .	202
	Hardness and softness cannot exist per se, nor can they be the subjects of other accidents. It remains therefore that there must be some subject . . . . .	202
	The body of Christ, i. e. sacramentally the sign and figure of the body itself . . . . .	202
	The most heresy that God suffered to come to His church is to trowe that this sacrament is accident without subject, and may in no wise be God's body . . . . .	202
F.	JOHN HUSS, JOHN OF HUSINEC IN BOHEMIA, RECTOR OF PRAGUE UNIVERSITY.	
	He that devoutly recollects the passion of Christ, spiritually eats His body, although he does not receive the venerated sacrament . . . . .	207
	As minister of Christ, he ministerially does...what Christ does with His own power and His own words, transubstantiating the bread into His body and the wine into His blood . . . . .	208
G.	JEROME OF PRAGUE.	
	Maintains a change of substances . . . . .	212
	Laud gives an exhortation at the Council of Constance . . . . .	213

<b>H. JOHN CHARLIER GERSON, OF CHAMPAGNE, CHANCELLOR OF PARIS.</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
He is now in His own species in Heaven, but under the species of the sacrament on the altar, &c. . . . .	215
The substance of the bread which by virtue of the word (This is My body) passes into the body of Christ instantaneously . . . . .	216
It is suitable to God's nature to be everywhere simply and in His own way. It is suitable to a creature to be only in one place. The body of Christ is in a middle mode, &c. . . . .	217
On account of the peril of spilling the blood, effusionis, it is ministered to the laity under one species (form, kind, &c.) . . . . .	217
It is asked whether the bread pass into flesh, soul, blood and Godhead. It is the whole Christ under each kind, &c., &c. . . . .	218
In what way would the good be made better, as to the soul, by corporeal food, which does not enter that soul? . . . . .	220
Reason ought to correct the judgment of the bodily senses, corporis iudicium . . . . .	221
<b>I. THOMAS à KEMPIS, FROM KEMPEN IN COLOGNE DIOCESE.</b>	
How shall I prepare in one hour to receive with reverence the world's Maker? . . . . .	224

## THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY.

<b>A. TOSTATUS, BISHOP OF AVILA IN SPAIN.</b>	
The object in appointing that bitter herbs (lettuce, endive, &c.) should be eaten with the passover, viz. as a pleasant vegetable . . . . .	230
<b>B. GENNADIUS, DOSITHEUS, CYRIL LUCAR, &amp;c. OF THE EASTERN CHURCH.</b>	
Not typically, nor in a likeness, &c., nor in impanation, so that the Godhead of the word is made one hypostatically with the bread, &c., as Luther, &c., but truly and in fact, so that after the consecration, &c. the bread is changed, transubstantiated, made different (transmade), changed in its course into the true body, &c. Yet Cyril Lucar says, not the newly-invented transubstantiation as vainly taught, &c. . . . .	235
<b>C. PROFESSOR ULLMANN ON THE STATE OF BELIEF AND PRACTICE BEFORE THE SPIRIT OF THE REFORMATION APPEARED.</b> . . . .	236
<b>D. ÆNEAS SILVIUS, POPE.</b>	
John vi. The sacramental eating is not prescribed, but a spiritual is suggested . . . . .	245
<b>E. WILLIAM TYNDALL, THE GREAT TRANSLATOR OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE.</b>	
The sacrament doth much more vehemently print lively the faith, &c. than bare words only, &c. . . . .	248
If they be absent the sacrament profiteth them as much as a sermon made in a church profiteth them that be in the fields. And how it profiteth the souls of the dead tell me, to whom it is no sign . . . . .	250
We eat His body, i. e. we surely believe that His body was crucified, &c. . . . .	251

F. JOHN FRITH.

PAGE

The manna was to them as the sacrament is to us, &c., yet were they never so mad as to believe that the manna was changed into Christ's own natural body . . . . . 254

We do eat Christ in faith both before we come to the sacrament and more expressly through the sacrament . . . . . 254

G. SIR THOMAS MORE.

They that believe that it is the very body and His very blood indeed, have the plain words of our Saviour Himself on their side for the ground and foundation of their faith . . . . . 255

If (the holy fathers) had thought either that it could not be there, or that it was not there indeed, they would not for all the good in the world have written as they have done, &c., &c. . . . . 255

Frith's reply ends, We mean that it (the body that was broken for us) is eaten with faith, &c., and therefore hath it the name of His body, because the name itself should put us in remembrance of His body, and that His body is there chiefly eaten, even more through faith than the meat with the mouth . . . . . 256

H. BISHOP MYLES COVERDALE, WHO SUPPLEMENTED TYNDALL'S WORK.

Why do they then call it a sacrifice, seeing it is but the remembrance of a sacrifice . . . . . 258

The bread thereof (not unworthily called His body), forasmuch as it doth not only represent it unto us, but also being unto us the same thing . . . 258

No remedy—therefore we must unfeignedly receive the body and blood of Christ in the supper, forasmuch as the Lord offereth to us therein the communion of them both . . . . . 258

We understand that in the supper Christ giveth unto us the very substance of the body and blood . . . . . 259

I. GIROLAMO SAVONAROLA, PRIOR OF ST MARK'S, FLORENCE.

If the exterior (of Christian worship, *i. e.* particularly of the sacraments) did not contain Divine virtue and truth necessary to form a first instrumental cause, it could never produce, maintain, and consummate that excellent effect, Christian holiness...of what avail were...bread and wine...if they were not the instruments of a superior cause? . . . . . 263

It is fitting that these sacraments, as instrumental causes, should confer grace. The sacraments do not attain to the essence of grace, but only to a disposition thereto . . . . . 263

A whole chapter from The Golden Book . . . . . 264

J. JOHN COLET, DEAN OF ST PAUL'S, THE FRIEND OF ERASMUS.

By gracious eucharist, wherein is the very presence of the person of Christ, under form of bread, we be nourished spiritually in God . . . . 272

In the blessed cup and the broken bread there is a saving communication of the very body and blood of Jesus Christ itself . . . . . 272

They are nourished, not themselves assimilating the nourishment, but being transformed by it, as by the stronger into itself . . . . . 272

This He does not only in regard of our souls by the communication of His Divinity, but also in regard of our bodies by the communication of His body . . . . . 273

## THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

A. DURAND OF ST PORCAIN.	PAGE
It is enquired whether water is to be mixed with this sacrament, and it is agreed that it is not. Many arguments and conclusion. Therefore it seems rash, that beyond His (Christ's) institution and ordinance, water should be added to the wine . . . . .	277
Holy fathers do not always observe propriety of speech, therefore some of the aforesaid sayings are found to have been said by some saints, and chiefly by Ambrose . . . . .	278
Although that be the common saying of many, yet since it has not been confirmed by the church, it is lawful to think the opposite . . . . .	279
If you lay down that (the substances of bread and wine) do not remain, many difficulties follow, <i>i.e.</i> how such accidents can nourish, can be corrupted, and how anything can be generated out of them . . . . .	279
Corporeal food it is not possible to eat in any way than by the body . . . . .	280
Besides the spiritual eating, which is within the power of the spirit according to its own nature, it is within its power to eat it sacramentally under such a veil [ <i>i.e.</i> of bread and wine] . . . . .	280
B. GERHARD OF ROTTERDAM, COMMONLY CALLED ERASMUS AND DESIDERIUS.	
To represent among them by mystic signs that which on the day following He was about to go through on the cross . . . . .	284
Another passover of a perfect kind according to the Spirit will be accomplished in the kingdom of God . . . . .	284
That which of all rites is most mystical, <i>res omnium maxime mystica</i> , ought to be handled in a pure and reverent manner . . . . .	288
It is not immediately to be accepted, as often as mention is made in the sacred books of bread being broken, that the Lord's body and blood were consecrated in the midst of disciples . . . . .	288
By this mystery is figured and confirmed the most intimate union, <i>conjunctio</i> , of the body with the Head, and such a mystical association of all that truly profess Christ's name as is natural between the members of the body of the same living being . . . . .	289
C. MARTIN LUTHER.	
The way in which Christ puts His body and blood, <i>immittat</i> , into the bread and wine is not by reason to be comprehended . . . . .	292
As He is wont to come into the heart without making any aperture for passage, <i>nullo facto foramine</i> ,...so also He passes, <i>migrat</i> , into the bread, &c. . . . .	292
There is not a creature of Christ's where He is not present, in flint, in fire, in the waters, &c., <i>nusquam non in omnibus creaturis præsens Christus est</i> . . . . .	293
(The Bohemians) certainly have Christ's word and deed on their side. But we have neither, but only that empty fiction of men—the church so ordered it—when it was not the church but the kings of the church's tyranny, that ordained those things without the conscience of the church and of God's people . . . . .	293
The Cardinal Camera's book. It were much more probable and much less would there be of superfluous miracle if true bread and true wine were on the altar, &c. . . . .	294

	PAGE
If then transubstantiation is to be determined, ponenda, &c. why not transaccidentation also? . . . . .	294
Ceremonies of a different kind would have to be introduced, or rather brought back, induci seu potius reduci, through Christendom . . . . .	295
The whole value of the mass consists in Christ's words that testify that remission of sins is given to all that believe . . . . .	295
It is a safer course to deny everything than to allow that the mass is a work, opus, or a sacrifice . . . . .	297
<b>D. HENRY VIII. OF ENGLAND.</b>	
The mass-ceremonies are to affect the simple minds of low people, plebecula, to turn them to commemorate the invisible Deity by means of the honour of a visible majesty of worship . . . . .	300
Luther may attain to this that the mass shall be rid not only of its apparatus of ceremonies, but also of the hope and veneration of the people that in crowds now come to it . . . . .	300
<b>E. BISHOP FISHER'S DEFENCE OF THE KING'S TREATISE.</b>	
It is not to be doubted that many customs (of worship) were introduced into the churches by the direction of the Holy Spirit . . . . .	301
Whatever was holy and healthful and approved generally by all Christians, this I doubt not was inspired of the Spirit . . . . .	301
Cited from the King against consubstantiation. Nor can any substance be worthy to be mixed with that Substance which made all substances. . . . .	302
Nor does the King mean Christ's flesh to be understood by creatrix substantia, creative substance . . . . .	302
<b>F. PHILIP MELANCHTHON.</b>	
When Luke and Paul say, This is the cup of the New Testament, it is a metonymy . . . . .	304
They (people of his time) interpret a sacrifice as that which, applied for others, deserves for them the remission of fault and the penalties, and that, from the mere work done, without any good motion of the (heart of the) receiver, Thus do they interpret the offering being performed in the mass for the living and the dead . . . . .	306
It is not possible to obtain remission of sins on account of another man's work, and without a good motion, <i>i. e.</i> faith of one's own. This fully refutes their opinion on the merits and application of the mass . . . . .	306
The Lord wished the Lord's supper to be the strength, nervum, of the public congregation . . . . .	308
It is a manifest profanation to carry about a portion of the Lord's supper and to adore it, circumgestare . . . . .	309
The greatness of the sins that the profanation of the Lord's supper is now in so many ages producing, it is beyond the eloquence of all men and of angels to utter . . . . .	309
<b>G. HULDERIC ZWINGEL.</b>	
Sacraments are given to bear public testimony to that grace which is previously present in private with every one . . . . .	312
That the whole transaction (of the redemption) becomes as it were present to faithful contemplation through Christ . . . . .	312
I believe that in the sacred supper of the eucharist ( <i>i. e.</i> of thanksgiving) Christ's true body is present to faithful contemplation ( <i>i. e.</i> that they recognize, &c. the truth of His incarnation and suffering) . . . . .	312

	PAGE
But that Christ's body in its essence or really ( <i>i.e.</i> the natural body itself) is either present in the supper, or by our mouth and teeth is eaten, we not only deny, but constantly affirm it to be an error opposed to the word of God . . . . .	312
We have never denied that Christ's body is sacramentally and in a mystery present in the supper, both on account of the contemplation of faith, and on account of the whole action of the sign . . . . .	313
If the body of Christ be limited, yet if it be clarified as ours also will be, it is corporally (present) now, and truly is, after that mode in which clarified bodies are. [This concedes everything hypothetically]. . . . .	313
It is not possible that anything corporeal or carnal be eaten here, since the soul cannot be filled or fed with any bodily food . . . . .	315
If His body cannot at all profit by being eaten, doubtless Christ did not determine to exhibit or give it to us to eat . . . . .	315
If His own body be in the Heaven above, it cannot be on this earth in a bodily form, even after the resurrection . . . . .	316
In no mode can it, like the Divinity, be in all places . . . . .	316
<b>H. HUGH LATIMER.</b>	
Christ spake never a word of sacrificing, therefore sacrificing priests should now cease for ever . . . . .	319
The supper of the Lord was instituted to provoke us to thanksgiving, &c. . . . .	319
To the faithful believer there is the real spiritual presence of the body of Christ . . . . .	319
There is none other presence of Christ required than a spiritual, &c. . . . .	319
This same, &c. may be called a real presence, &c. See Remarks . . . . .	319
<b>I. THOMAS BECON, CHAPLAIN TO CRANMER.</b>	
If the substance of bread and wine be turned, &c. &c., the sacrament is the real, natural, corporeal, and substantial body of Christ . . . . .	322
As Christ's body still abideth a creature and is not swallowed up (if I may so speak) of the Divine nature, &c., Christ's body, taken up into Heaven, neither is nor can be in Heaven and earth at once . . . . .	322
Christ's body is not then in every pix and in every altar, &c. . . . .	322
He that goeth about to pluck from the sacrament, &c. the bread and wine, destroyeth utterly the aforesaid sacrament and maketh it no sacrament . . . . .	322
<b>J. CRANMER.</b>	
That flesh is received spiritually . . . . .	324
The very body of the tree, or rather the roots of the weeds, is, &c. the real presence of Christ's flesh and blood in the sacrament of the altar (as they call it), &c. &c. . . . .	325
As at the Lord's table the priest distributeth wine and bread to feed the body, so we must think that inwardly by faith we see Christ feeding both body and soul unto eternal life . . . . .	325
In which supper as in body we receive the true bread and wine, so in spirit are we nourished by the true body and blood of our Saviour and Redeemer, Jesus Christ . . . . .	325
What benefit is it to a wicked man to eat Christ and to receive death? . . . . .	325
<b>K. JOHN KNOX. PROFESSOR LORIMER'S BOOKS. JOHN KNOX AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.</b>	
The controversy about "sitting" concluded by Cranmer after producing and passing the rubric on kneeling, Oct. 7, 1552 . . . . .	327

## L. NICHOLAS RIDLEY.

PAGE

If He be now really present in the body of His flesh, the supper must cease, for a remembrance is not of a thing present, &c. . . . . 330

The natural substance of bread and wine is the true natural substance of the holy sacrament, &c. . . . . 330

Not only a signification, but also, given to the faithful, the grace of Christ's body, *i.e.* the food of life and immortality . . . . . 331

He gave Himself in a real communication, *i.e.* He gave His flesh after a communication of His flesh . . . . . 331

Not after the manner of bodily substance . . . . . 331

The sacrament is the very true and natural body and blood of Christ, even that which was born of the virgin Mary . . . . . 331

We (*i.e.* Ridley and his examiners) only differ in modo . . . . . 331

I confess Christ's natural body to be in the sacrament indeed, by spirit and grace; because that whosoever receiveth worthily that bread and wine receiveth effectuously Christ's body and blood, &c. . . . . 332

The natural substance of Christ's human nature, &c. is in Heaven, &c. and not here enclosed in the form of bread . . . . . 334

The same natural substance of the very body and blood of Christ, &c. hath not only life in itself, but is also to give and doth give life, &c., though the self-same substance abide still in Heaven . . . . . 334

## M. JOHN CALVIN.

An invisible aliment, which we receive from Christ's flesh and blood . . 337

That He is truly exhibited to us no otherwise than as if He were present and set before our sight and handled by our hands . . . . . 338

That Christ's body is the only food, *unicum cibum*, to make the soul flourish, and to make alive . . . . . 338

That His own body would be for (*i.e.* instead of) bread for the spiritual food of the soul . . . . . 338

He seals that exhibition by the sacred mystery of His supper . . . 338

Though a sign of the body has been received, let us not any the less believe that the body itself also is certainly given . . . . . 340

That sophistical fiction that the sacraments of the new law confer grace on all who do not put in the way the obstacle of mortal sin. *Helvetic conferences* . . . . . 341

Grace was never tied to them, *i.e.* to sacraments. *Ibid.* . . . . 341

We must take away every fancy of a local presence (*of Christ's body*). Christ, as far as He is man, is nowhere else than in Heaven. *Ibid.* . . 341

We do not judge it to be less absurd to place Christ under bread, or to couple Him with bread, than to transubstantiate bread into His body. *Ibid.* . . . . . 342

## N. ROGER ASCHAM, TUTOR TO EDWARD VI. AND THE LADY ELIZABETH.

Appeal to a fair judge on comparing Christ and His disciples at the institution, with a modern priest performing mass alone . . . . . 344

As adoration of the eucharist is nowhere commanded, it is worshipping God in a way that may displease Him . . . . . 345

What has keeping the Sabbath holy come to? Only the mass . . . 345

All men's religion is the mass . . . . . 346



	PAGE
Great men think they have done all, if they have set up in their houses a massing priest . . . . .	346
Were the mass removed, most priests could find nothing to do . . . . .	347
The mass has driven good teachers of the word into other callings . . . . .	347
 O. JEWEL.	
Being spiritually understood it will give you life . . . . .	349
By them Christ Himself, being the true bread of eternal life, is so presently given to us, that by faith we verily receive His body and blood . . . . .	350
That was not Christ's meaning that the wheaten bread should lay apart its own nature and receive a certain Divinity . . . . .	350
And we do expressly pronounce that in the Lord's supper there is truly given unto the believing the body and blood of our Lord, the flesh of the Son of God . . . . .	351
 P. CORNELIUS JANSEN, BISHOP OF GHENT, A PARTLY ENLIGHTENED ROMANIST.	
That under the sacrament of bread and wine are truly continued to us (as in unbroken succession) Christ's flesh and blood . . . . .	354
 Q. WOLFGANG MUSCULUS, NATIVE OF LORRAINE, PROFESSOR AT BERNE.	
Not the signs of Christ's death, but His death itself justifies . . . . .	356
Therefore sacraments do not justify . . . . .	356
 R. JOHN HOOPER.	
I deny any miracle at all to be in the sacrament, but everything wrought by God accustomedly—by faith, remission of sins, &c., and the signs to remain in their proper nature . . . . .	359
It is a visible word, which preacheth peace . . . . .	359
 S. PARKER.	
As to using wafer-bread and the superstition therein . . . . .	360
 T. PETER MARTYR, NATIVE OF FLORENCE, PROFESSOR AT OXFORD.	
It is not even said of angels, &c. that they can be present in divers places at once . . . . .	362
Let them strive as far as they will, as far as they know how, and as far as they can, they will never escape the charge that the potion they drink is of blood . . . . .	363
As if their boasted and fought for presence, &c. can be of better, superior, or any other use than we get from a spiritual perception, &c. . . . .	363
That the body is spiritually present to communicants does not mean invisibly only, but further, is present, as the Papists say, in its own self, propria . . . . .	364
As the number three cannot be six, &c. so it is not possible that what is the human body can cease to be, non sit, a human body, the definition of which necessarily comprehends magnitude, distinct parts and limbs . . . . .	365
As concerns the faithful they are efficacious instruments . . . . .	366
Neither in the signs nor in the communicants themselves do I admit a real and substantial presence of Christ, nor can I acknowledge it . . . . .	366
Yet I should not doubt but should affirm that a communion and partaking of His body and blood, of a spiritual kind, spiritualem, is given to communicants, which also may be had, before the eating in the sacrament . . . . .	366

U. JOHN BRADFORD.	PAGE
Not that I mean any other presence of Christ's body than a presence by grace, a presence by faith, a presence spiritually and not corporeally really naturally and carnally . . . . .	369
Till He come. Whereby He doeth us to wit that corporeally He is not there in the form of bread . . . . .	368
V. ROGER HUTCHINSON, OF CAMBRIDGE.	
The Council of Rouen did first forbid men to take it in their hands. Regard more Christ's example . . . . .	370
W. JOHN HAUSSCHEIN, MINISTER OF BASLE, CALLED ECOLAMPADIUS.	
But they are nothing else than the body itself, ipsummet corpus, and the blood-itself . . . . .	372
If we truly and with the whole heart believed that in this manner Christ was at hand, it would be wonderful if we could be torn away from adoring Him, &c. . . . .	372
It is manifest that there is no miracle in the mystic bread, beyond human apprehension . . . . .	375, 376
X. MARTIN BUCER, MINISTER OF STRASBURG, BURIED AT ST MARY'S, CAMBRIDGE.	
Those His words, by which to sanctify the sacrament (the Lord's supper) to us, quibus sanctificaret . . . . .	381
In all this life's graver actions we add signs to words. He therefore gave (such) here . . . . .	381
He gave to the saints separately His own body by the sign (symbols) of bread, His own blood (by the sign) of wine; not that these were then separated or are now: but He wished by it to express that He is the sacred victim of our salvation, and that He restores us by His own death (by the offering of His own flesh and blood) . . . . .	381
As the Sun...so God the Lord, even though He is circumscribed to one spot of Heaven, &c., yet by His own word and sacred signs is exhibited, Himself, God and man, truly and wholly present in the sacred supper, and therefore substantially . . . . .	382
Y. HENRY BULLINGER, SUCCESSOR TO ZWINGEL AT ZURICH.	
The sacraments give not that which they have not within themselves; but they have not grace and righteousness and Heavenly gifts . . . . .	388
Whereas it is objected that by a certain Heavenly covenant it is appointed by God that sacraments should have grace in themselves; and should from themselves, as by pipes, convey abroad the water of grace unto them that are thirsty—that is alleged without warrant of Scripture, and is repugnant unto true religion . . . . .	388
Z. ERASTUS; TO WHOM VERY DIFFERENT OPINIONS ARE GENERALLY ASSIGNED.	
His argument—a curious one—that unspirituality and even known crime do not exclude from the Lord's supper, as they did not from the Passover. On this ground he reasons against church power to excommunicate . . . . .	393
AA. EDMUND GESTE, BISHOP OF SALISBURY: REVISED THE PRAYER-BOOK FOR PARKER.	
How can they be rightly named bread and wine, without their own proper matter and substance? . . . . .	397
Aaron's rod, being altered into an adder, had not only the substance thereof, but also the outward fashion of the same, and no similitude of a rod at all, &c. &c. . . . .	397

	PAGE
Worms cannot be engendered or fed of an accident, but of a substance alone . . . . .	398
Questionless their meaning is that the said sacrifice appeaseth God's ire and indignation and cleanseth sin . . . . .	399
<b>BB. EDMUND GRINDAL, PRIMATE.</b>	
I do conclude that the sacrament is not the body of Christ, first, because it, the sacrament, is not in Heaven neither at the Father's right hand, &c. . . . .	401
<b>CC. EDWIN SANDYS, ARCHBISHOP OF YORK.</b>	
They are God's seals added unto His most certain promises . . . . .	402
We must lift ourselves from these external and earthly signs, and like eagles fly up and soar aloft, there to feed on Christ, &c. . . . .	403
<b>DD. JOHN WHITGIFT, PRIMATE.</b>	
That the outward signs, &c. do not contain in them grace, neither yet that the grace of God is of necessity tied to them, but only that they be seals of God's promise, notes of Christianity, &c. . . . .	404
<b>EE. JAMES PILKINGTON, BISHOP OF DURHAM.</b>	
With what face can they say we have no consecration? If consecration stand on words, we have all the words, &c. . . . .	405
<b>FF. WILLIAM FULKE, MASTER OF ST JOHN'S. ANSWERED RHEMISH VERSION AND NOTES.</b>	
Presbyter should signify nothing but an elder: but, by usurpation, priest is commonly taken to signify a sacrificer . . . . .	409
Because the Scripture calleth the ministers of the New Testament by divers other names, and never by the name of <i>lepeis</i> , we thought it necessary to observe the distinction (in translating the New Testament), which we see the Holy Ghost hath so precisely observed . . . . .	409
<b>GG. THEODORE BEZA. THE FRIEND AND SUCCESSOR OF CALVIN AT GENEVA.</b>	
If what I have now said concerning the eating of My flesh offend you, &c. how much more will it appear incredible, when it will be absent from you, received into the Heavens . . . . .	411
From whom ( <i>i.e.</i> from the Capernaïtes) neither transubstantialists nor consubstantialists differ ever so little, with whatever paint of the real essence of Christ's flesh itself they hide up the dogma, &c. . . . .	412
<b>HH. MARTIN CHEMNITZ. THE SUPERINTENDENT IN SAXONY. ITS MELANCHTHON.</b>	
Since He has explicitly promised in the very words of the New Testament the presence of His own body and blood in the supper, we believe it simply and without any gainsaying, although such a presence seems to be inconsistent, pugnare, with the natural properties of a natural body . . . . .	420
<b>II. THOMAS DE VIO, CARDINAL; CALLED CAJETAN FROM GAIETA.</b>	
Luke xxii. He gave thanks for the termination of the old sacrifices . . . . .	424
He does not say, shall be given, but is given; because it had begun to be given. Already He had been sold . . . . .	425
<b>JJ. JOHN MALDONATUS, LECTURER IN SALAMANCA AND PARIS.</b>	
Our opinion is that a sacrament's nature does not require the thing (signified) to be either present or absent, but only that something unseen be indicated to the mind, &c....The Holy Ghost was truly in the dove; yet the dove truly is a sign of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit was present in the tongues on fire, &c. . . . .	427

When we compare the eucharist of the sacrifice, &c. on the cross, we deny that it degenerates in some way from that most true sacrifice, if all things be considered that customarily are in a sacrifice . . . . . 428

# KK. ROBERT BELLARMINE.

John vi. If the Lord had only promised that His body should be received by faith, it would not have been harder but easier to receive it in this way, for those who had seen Christ's ascension. [Clever perversion!] . . . . . 431

Whether the subject itself of the chapter is spiritual eating . . . . . 431

If bread in that place signifies Christ as thus received by faith, without any reference to sacramental species, He would not say it in the future (I will give). [Ans. It refers to His dying on the cross] . . . . . 432

The ancients always call (this sacrament) the Lord's body and blood, which they do not when they speak of other signs, &c. &c., about what the fathers held and did in relation to it . . . . . 433

In no way can a thing not be changed and yet be a different thing. [N.B. We say it is not a different thing] . . . . . 435

The word of God nowhere makes it an exception to God's omnipotence that one body can be in two places . . . . . 436

Those only things is God unable to do, to do which is not doing but failing (as lying is failing to be true): but for one body to be in two places clearly cannot be reduced to that class. [Ans. Yes it can. It is failing to maintain the first physical principles], &c. . . . . 436

The whole Christ exists in the eucharist with magnitude and all accidents, the relation to its place in Heaven excepted, &c., and those which follow with reference to its existence there . . . . . 437

On the other hand the whole Christ exists in Heaven with magnitude and all accidents, its relation to the species of bread excepted, &c. . . . . 437

# LL. HOSPINIAN, CHANCELLOR OF ZURICH, WHO DEFENDS BUT MISTAKES ZWINGEL.

Z. Non, non hanc significationem inanem vacuum nudam sine certissimâ rei significatæ presentiam. What is a real presence of the body, then? . . . . . 440

He (Z.) is not in every place clear and safe . . . . . 440

Z. Docuit Domini veram presentiam, corpus, &c., the true body . . . . . 440

False to say, My body is drawn away from this sacrament, and shut up in Heaven . . . . . 440

Z. defended from H. . . . . 440

Z. says, it is all done, not bodily, but spiritually, by faith . . . . . 441

Z. Liturgy for the Lord's Supper in Zurich. Praised by one of our great bishops. The name has escaped me . . . . . 441

# MM. WILLIAM WHITAKER, PROFESSOR AT CAMBRIDGE.

Christ instituted such sacraments to instruct us through the sense. . . . . 444

# NN. PAREUS, PROFESSOR AND COUNCILLOR OF STATE AT HEIDELBERG.

The idolatry of a theatrical mass . . . . . 445

Christians were said...to be the only men that had no sacrifices . . . . . 445

The mass-making priest, murmuring lowly in five words, a consecration over the host, For this is My body, so that at the last instant of the syllable "um" the bread is changed into the substantial body of Christ, &c. . . . . 446

This is daily offered to God the Father for an expiation of all sins and for the redemption of the living and the dead in Heaven and in purgatory 446

The Lutherans think there are two substances under the same accidents in one place really present . . . . . 447

The ubiquity of Christ's body does not follow from its union with the Godhead. For there was this union but no ubiquity in all His lowly condition (on earth). The union was unbroken, but there was no ubiquity . 447

OO. ROBERT ABBOT, BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

To a true and real sacrifice there is necessary a true and real death or destroying of the thing sacrificed, &c. With such argument the great Jesuit is so troubled that he staggereth like a drunken man, and indeed knoweth not what to say . . . . . 451

PP. RICHARD HOOKER.

Till Christ be formed in you; Did the blessed apostle mean materially and really to create Christ in them, flesh and blood, soul and body? No, but according to that intellectual comprehension that the mind is capable of 453

Coupled and joined to Christ, as flesh of His flesh and bone of His bones, by the mutual bond of His unspeakable love towards them, and through unfeigned faith in Him, thus linked and fastened together by a spiritual, sincere, and hearty affection and love. On Hooker. See Part III. . . . 453

Nor do they, the sacraments, really contain in them that grace which with them or by them it pleaseth God to bestow . . . . . 453

Our conjunction with Christ...a mutual participation whereby each is blended with the other, His flesh and blood with ours, &c. which gross conceit doth fight openly against reason. For are not we and Christ personally distinguished? &c. . . . . 453

QQ. ADRIAN SARAVIA, A VERY CLOSE FRIEND OF HOOKER AT THE FIRST.

There are three things in any sacrament: (1) the sign, &c., (2) the thing, &c., (3) the fruit . . . . . 457

We must at length return to this, that Christ the Lord in reality delivered His own body and blood to His own disciples in His own supper; but the mode of doing it surpasses human understanding . . . . . 458

But not absolutely and simply, as they are now locally by dimension in one spot of Heaven, but in type, by a certain necessary relation to body and blood, and by a sacramental union. [Bellarmine can be understood. This not] . . . . . 459

There is one mode of Christ's presence in Heaven; another in the sacrament . . . . . 459

A bodily and a spiritual eating are not things contrary to one another . 460

Let it no longer be said to Christian ears that it is impossible for the bodily mouth to eat Christ's flesh and drink His blood spiritually . 460, 461

Present in His own body in many places by a supernatural mode where-ever God will . . . . . 460

Divine mysteries are not to be examined by physical reasonings . . 462

RR. JOHN RAINOLDUS, OR RAINOLDS, PRESIDENT C.C.C., OXFORD.

As for your Rhemists (translators, N. T.) who still translate sacerdos (Vulgate) a priest...and yet translate presbyter by the same word, they do join together that which God hath severed, &c. . . . . 464

The Jewish fathers affirming that God gave on Mount Sinai the Scriptures and the Talmud, &c. Papists say that the apostles received from Christ, &c. They divide the word of God with Scripture and tradition, partiuntur . . . . . 465

Scarcely any vestige of its institution can be discerned in the Lord's supper . . . . . 466

Propitiatory, not as shadowing Christ to us, but truly and in its own nature propitiatory, vere proprieque . . . . . 467

They do salute in a like way the holy oil and Mary, saying, Hail sacred chrism . . . . . 468

#### SS. LANCELOT ANDREWES, BISHOP OF WINCHESTER.

If such power be in the Spirit, and the blood be the vehiculum of the Spirit, how may we partake of His blood? It shall be offered you straight in the cup of blessing....In which blood is the Spirit of Christ. In which Spirit is all spiritual power, &c. . . . . 471

These three to offer to God: our soul by prayer, our body by abstinence, and our goods by alms-deeds—the threefold Christian holocaust or whole burnt offering . . . . . 471

#### TT. THE REV. HENRY SMITH, SILVER-TONGUED, PREFERRED BY LORD BURLEIGH.

Christ would that we, touching the signs, should draw virtue from Himself . . . . . 473

Here is the fruit of His thanks, before He prayed that the bread and wine might be blessed, and they were blessed . . . . . 473

His blessing has infused that virtue into it that it doth not only represent His body, but convey His body and Himself into us. See extracts in full . . . . . 473

If Christ's very body was offered in the sacrament, then it were not a sacrament, but a sacrifice . . . . . 474

Now mark the wisdom of the Holy Ghost. Lest we should take this for a sacrifice, He never names altar when He speaks of it, but the table of the Lord . . . . . 474

If it were the flesh of Christ they (the wicked) should receive salvation rather than "judgment" . . . . . 474

#### UU. JOHN FOX.

Five students. Neither the sacraments of the old law nor of the new law do give grace, but shew Him unto us Which giveth grace indeed . . . 476

John Rogers. I cannot understand really and substantially to signify other than corporeally . . . . . 478

Thomas Causton. This holy supper is sore abused...in that it is worshipped contrary to the commandment, Thou shalt worship nothing made with hands . . . . . 478

Oh ye will have nothing more than the Scripture teacheth; but even as Christ left it bare . . . . . 478

From Cranmer's recantations. I believe and worship in the sacrament of the altar, the very body and blood of Christ being contained most truly under the forms of bread and wine . . . . . 479

#### VV. BISHOP MORTON, OF DURHAM.

The meaning of the word missa, "dismissing." An argument against Rome who wishes to behold it as a spectacle . . . . . 481

#### WW. ARMINIUS OF LEYDEN.

Neque secundum locum corpori aut sanguini copulantur, ita ut corpus sit, vel in vel sub vel cum pane . . . . . 484

Sacrificium falso cœnæ Dominicæ institutioni tribui; non instituit Christus sacrificium sed sacramentum . . . . . 484

<b>XX. CORNELIUS À LAPIDE, PROFESSOR AT LOUVAIN AND ROME.</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
John vi. The flesh profiteth not at all. You will say, Then Christ's flesh is not present nor eaten in the eucharist. I answer, That cannot be said. Christ's flesh (crucified) did and doth much profit the world . . .	487
<b>YY. FRANCIS OF SALES, PUPIL OF MALDONAT, PRINCE BISHOP OF GENEVA.</b>	
After the general confession she made an entire resolution by a full prostration, followed by the Holy Communion, in which giving herself to the Saviour and receiving Him, le recevant, she entered happily into His holy love . . .	492
That when Christ says, This is My body, He shews clearly that the bread is changed. (See extract in full). . .	493
Really and spiritually. The third of three modes of reception . . .	493
<b>ZZ. ANDREW WILLET, SYNOPSIS PAPISMI, A VAST COLLECTION OF TREATISES.</b>	
We do not hold that it is an essential part of a sacrament always to have a sermon before it, &c., which, notwithstanding, were most convenient and always to be wished . . .	495
<b>AAA. CAPRERA, PETER, OF SPAIN.</b>	
The sacraments of the new law signify that Christ is to be conferred by the sacraments themselves as by instruments of the passion of Christ. One of the chief benefits is that grace is conferred on us by the sacrament, ex opere operato, <i>i.e.</i> do the work and it gives the benefit . . .	497
The sacrament of the eucharist contains Christ substantially, but the rest (of the sacraments) contain (only) a certain institutional virtue [virtue in them according to their institution], partaken of from Christ . . .	497
<b>BBB. RICHARD CRANKTHORP.</b>	
Is the adoration of the eucharist under the suspicion of idolatry? . . .	499
The uncertainty of the admitted prerequisites to the fulfilment of transubstantiation (on Romish principles) . . .	500
As to Christ's body lying hid ( <i>latens</i> ) in the bread . . .	501
Is the bread given at the institution other than spiritual food? . . .	501
In the mass there is no true and proper sacrifice . . .	502
The eucharist is not to be adored . . .	502
The pontificals are truly idolaters . . .	502

## THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

### A. THORNDIKE.

Cassander complains of the Church of England abolishing the form of consecration which is general in the fathers . . .	503
How shall any common sense be satisfied whether the minister hath consecrated the same or not? . . .	503
The adoration of the eucharist, which the Church of Rome presenteth is not necessarily idolatry . . .	503
I suppose them to believe that the elements are not there, having ceased to be, that they might make room for the body and blood of Christ . . .	503
Natural body and corporeal presence of Christ are equivalent terms . . .	504
Church authorities not the authoritative expounders of the word of God . . .	505

<b>B. DAUGHTER OF DANIEL CLARKSON.</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
Sights of glory...never wished to go to the world again . . . .	506
<b>C. ARCHBISHOP USHER.</b>	
The Dublin Articles of 1615 on this sacrament . . . . .	508
The dates of his writings on this subject . . . . .	510
How far is the Body of Divinity compiled or written by Usher? . . .	510
The advance of Usher's opinions—not altered in substance, but only in use	510
His uses of the word "real" . . . . .	509, 513, 516
The bread and wine are not changed in nature but in use . . . .	511
If the bread were turned into Christ, then would there be two Christs— one that giveth and another that is given . . . . .	512
What does that signify? our uniting with Christ and enjoying of Him; that we must with delight apply Christ and His merits to all the necessities of our souls, &c. . . . .	512
But some say, Nothing is impossible with God. The question is here not of the power but of the will of God . . . . .	512
In the inward (action of the communicant) we do by faith really receive the body and blood of our Lord . . . . .	513
The thing which is delivered in the external part of the sacrament cannot be conceived to be really...the flesh and blood of Christ . . . . .	515
It being proved that the word "this" doth demonstrate the bread, it must of necessity follow that Christ affirming this to be His body cannot be conceived to have meant it to be so properly, but relatively and sacra- mentally . . . . .	516, 517
The real order of Christ's separate acts in the institution . . . .	517
<b>D. JOSEPH HALL, BISHOP OF NORWICH.</b>	
Transubstantiation and the multipresence of Christ's body. I know not which I should prefer for madness and sophistical cozenage . . . .	519
That it should be corporally, carnally, orally present, it hath ever seemed impious to us . . . . .	520
How mad is this that they will overturn the principles of nature, &c. &c., rather than they will, where necessity requires it, admit but of a tropical kind of speech . . . . .	520
That the body of Christ is truly offered and truly received which of us hath not constantly taught and defended? . . . . .	520
For any propitiating sacrifice, unless representative, I find none, &c., neither can there be . . . . .	520
Away then with those nice scruplers who...have endeavoured to keep us in suspense with a "non licet inquirere de modo" (saying, we must not ask questions about the mode) . . . . .	522
<b>E. CORNELIUS JANSEN, OF YPRES, FOLLOWER OF AUGUSTINE, FRIEND OF DU VERGIER DE HAURANNE, AND FOUNDER OF JANSENISM.</b>	
Most suitably to signify the separation of the body and the blood in the passion, and that both are made truly our food and drink, &c. . . .	524
Christ signifies that His blood was even then being poured out, i.e. offered to God, which is properly called, libari, and libation . . . .	526
For the remission of sins, properly its effect, as of a sacrifice not of a sacrament . . . . .	526



The flesh of Christ, indeed in reality, *re ipsa quidem*, but yet in a sacrament; not by faith only, but not without faith and love is to be eaten . . . 527

Not as if He were speaking of a figurative, metaphorical eating of the flesh, or through faith alone, as heretics dream . . . 527

#### F. GEORGE CALIXTUS.

Reasons which may have led the ancients to call it a sacrifice . . . 529

Very pronounced Lutheran views on this sacrament . . . 530

Historical reference, beginning from Charles the Bald's reign . . . 530

Discussion with Bellarmine. What is a true sacrifice? . . . 531

Our mingling water with the wine. Assumption of De Lyra . . . 531

#### G. JOSEPH MEDE, OF CHRIST'S, CAMBRIDGE.

As God confers no manner of blessing on us, but through Christ, so the manner and metre of a sacrament is to confirm unto us whatever it assures, only through Him . . . 534

That which is the communion of Christ is bread still. 1 Cor. x. . . 534

St Paul himself calls them as they are, &c. The bread which we break, &c. 534

He that receiveth the bread as assuredly receiveth Christ's body as if the bread were Christ's body . . . 534

Receiving it unto the substance of our body and into our blood by way of nourishment, the body of Christ becomes our body, and His blood is made our blood . . . 535

That lurching sacrifice of the mass, where the bread and wine are offered as a sacrifice for the people, but they receive no one jot thereof . . . 535

They think it enough that the priest eats all himself . . . 535

#### H. JOHN BRAMHALL, PRIMATE OF IRELAND, "ARDMAGH."

That which weighs most with us is this, that we dare not give Divine worship to any creature. No, not to the very humanity of Christ in the abstract (much less to the host), &c. . . 537

Shew us such an union (hypostatical) betwixt the Deity and the elements (or accidents). But you pretend to no such things, &c. . . 537

If you understand another propitiatory sacrifice, distinct from that (of the cross), for confessedly the priest is not the same, the temple is not the same, &c. &c. . . 537

Surely you cannot think that Christ did sacrifice Himself at His last supper. Then His subsequent sacrifice on the cross had been superfluous 538

Here is a commemorative, impetrative and applicative sacrifice, &c. I cannot understand what you desire more. To make it a suppletory sacrifice. To supply the defects of the only true sacrifice, &c. N.B. The commemoration of a sacrifice . . . 538

The fathers did not teach transubstantiation, either name or thing. Mark it well—for the first four centuries [a rare asseveration] . . . 538

#### I. JOHN COSIN, BISHOP OF DURHAM.

A true, proper and propitiatory sacrifice of Christ, *toties quoties*, i.e. as often as this sacrament is celebrated, which is the popish doctrine, and which cannot be done without killing Christ so often again . . . 540

I cannot see where any difference is between us (i.e. us and learned Papists) about the real presence . . . 539

- Before consecration we called them God's creatures of bread and wine; we do so no more after consecration . . . . . 541
- Formally and truly it may be called a sacrifice, also in the very natural signification of a sacrifice, for aught I know any harm should come of it . . . . . 541
- The eucharist...and to appease His wrath toward us . . . . . 540
- J. EDMONDE ALBERTIN, PASTEUR AT CHARENTON.**
- The bread not changed substantially but accidentally only, by addition of meaning and grace, and does not become properly the Lord's body and blood, but a likeness, a figure symbolical &c., used much in Part III. . . . . 544
- K. EDWARD REYNOLDS, BISHOP OF NORWICH.**
- Things begun by devout men piously, and continued with zeal, afterwards degenerate into superstition . . . . . 546
- Whose sacred body...in regard of its cooperation, force, efficacy, unlimited by any place or subject . . . . . 546
- Presence, real being, a metaphysical term is not opposed to a mere local absence or distance . . . . . 547
- L. WILLIAM CHILLINGWORTH, STUDIED AT DOUAI AFTER OXFORD.**
- To say they (things) are severed but not according to place...is to say they are severed and not severed . . . . . 550
- I see plainly and with mine own eyes that there are popes against popes, councils against councils, some fathers against others, the same fathers against themselves, a consent of fathers of one age against a consent of fathers of another age, &c. &c. . . . . 549
- M. JOHN LIGHTFOOT, MASTER OF CATHARINE HALL, CANON OF ELY.**
- The lamb in the passover was evidently of Divine institution, and so indeed was the bread: but what the authority for the wine? But yet Christ rejected the lamb and instituted the sacrament in bread and wine . . . . . 551
- The wine is now a representation of Christ's blood, because the shedding of blood...was now about to cease . . . . . 552
- This cup is not only a sign, &c., but also the very sanction itself of the New Covenant, of the whole System of the Gospel . . . . . 552
- N. RALPH CUDWORTH, PROFESSOR OF HEBREW, CAMBRIDGE. MASTER OF CHRIST'S COLLEGE.**
- It is a great mistake in most of our learned writers to think that the killing of every sacrifice was proper to the priest . . . . . 555
- The Lord's supper is not a sacrifice, but *epulum ex rñs divinis* [a feast on what is taken out of a sacrifice]...not the offering up of something to God, but the eating of something which comes from God's altar and is set upon our tables . . . . . 555
- Neither was it ever known among the Jews or heathens that the tables, upon which they did eat their sacrifices, should be called by the name of altars . . . . . 555
- O. HENRY HAMMOND, ARCHDEACON OF CHICHESTER.**
- A commemoration of the death of Christ; a representing the passion to God: (1) to offer our sacrifices of praises and supplications; (2) to commemorate that His daily continual sacrifice or intercession for us, at the right hand of His Father, now in Heaven . . . . . 559

	PAGE
The lamb was wont to be called The body of the Passover, answerable to, This is the bread of affliction which, &c. . . . .	559
Do this, Do all that I have done in your presence . . . . .	559
P. SUPERINTENDENT ECKHART, OF SCHWARTZBURG.	
Panis John vi. est panis metaphrice dictus . . . . .	560
Q. ANTOINE ARNAULD, LEADER OF THE SORBONNE, DRIVEN OUT BY THE JESUITS.	
Under the pretext of representing the usefulness of frequent communion (the Jesuit) was ruining all the dispositions necessary for it, without which this holy food is turned to poison . . . . .	564
R. THE ARNAULDS OF PORT ROYAL.	
Such strong opinions, that the Abbess had administration, once even to 17 times in a day . . . . .	573
Duvergier de Hauranne of St Cyran, the bosom friend of Jansenius of Ypres . . . . .	574
S. JEREMY TAYLOR, BISHOP OF DOWN AND CONNOR.	
In Scripture it is as plainly affirmed to be bread as it is called Christ's body. It cannot be both in the true natural sense...one must be figurative. We ought to give judgment on that side to which we are prompted by common sense . . . . .	576
If Christ had only said, This is My body, and no apostle had told also that it is bread, &c. &c. One must be expounded tropically . . . . .	576
We may not render Divine worship to Him, as present in the blessed sacrament or host according to His human nature without danger of idolatry, because He is not there according to His human nature, and therefore you give Divine worship to a <i>non ens</i> , which must needs be idolatry. . . . .	577
Hardest is the word "corporally." It may mean really and without fiction, and substantially too [Strange tampering with terms] . . . . .	579
Heber, in Life of Taylor, on the word "real," &c. . . . .	578, 579
Spiritual experience essentially necessary to intelligence . . . . .	579
T. HENRY MORE, CHRIST'S COLLEGE, A NOTED PLATONIST. (GIBSON'S PRESERV.)	
The primitive fathers had (would have) warranted them that there was (ia) a twofold presence, body and blood of Christ, the one natural, the other spiritual and Divine, which we do really receive in the holy communion . . . . .	580
U. JOHN OWEN, DEAN OF CHRIST CHURCH AND CHANCELLOR OF OXFORD.	
This is one of the great mysteries of the Roman magic and juggling, that corporal elements should have power to forgive sins and convey spiritual grace . . . . .	584
Spiritual and mystical, not carnal or fleshly. To imagine any other participation of Christ in this life by faith is to overthrow the Gospel . . . . .	584
The body and blood of Christ are really exhibited and communicated to the souls of believers as the outward signs unto their bodily senses . . . . .	585
How the errors arose . . . . .	585
If in the course of their unholiness you give them pledges of their salva- tion by Him, they will not much regard your other exhortations. The church is damaged by the want of a careful inspection, &c. . . . .	586
A great sin in a church to neglect this overseeing . . . . .	586

## V. FRANCIS TURRETIN, PROFESSOR AT GENEVA.

PAGE

The words, *This is My body*, have not the form of a prayer, and they ask nothing, and they are addressed to the apostles and not to God, &c. . . . 587

None can doubt that Christ wished by His own prayer to seek for God's blessing on the signs which were as necessary as they were suitable to the sacred use to which they were being appointed . . . . 587

When the proper sense of the letter involves anything absurd or contradictory, we must of necessity fly to the figurative sense . . . . 587

When the speaker's scope is the cause and the occasion of the saying and the disposition of the audience, the place and time of their own accord lead us to a figure and a trope . . . . 588

Though the doors had been shut, they could yield to the Creator and open at His nod . . . . 588

## W. WILLIAM OUTRAM, ARCHDEACON OF LEICESTER.

Melchizedek is not called a priest because he brought forth bread and wine, &c. . . . 589

Eucharistic sacrifices (of thanksgiving) under the law . . . . 590

To appear in the presence and to offer Himself to God seem to me one and the same thing . . . . 590

## X. JAMES BENIGNE BOSSUET.

Argument from the Jews actually eating the flesh of the sacrifices . . . 594

Argument from the Calvinists, assertion that they hold a true and real participation of Christ's body . . . . 595

Argument from Jesus not saying that He means his words to be figuratively understood . . . . 595

Explanation of the general laws of language . . . . 595

Illustration from children approaching a father's tomb . . . . 596

Jesus present on the table intercedes in Heaven . . . . 597

The object ought to be adored . . . . 598

The eucharist a remedy against sinning . . . . 598

Christ's body, soul, and Divinity all there . . . . 599

Argument from "being guilty of the Lord's body and blood" . . . 599

Faults of some confessors . . . . 600

## (MADAME GUION.)

Argument from "being guilty, &c." . . . . 599

Appeal to wicked priests . . . . 600

Appeal to priests to urge penitent sinners to the table . . . . 600, 601

Reference to Professor Upham's *Life of Madame Guion* . . . . 601

## Y. JEAN CLAUDE.

The many terms of the Greek church that savour of transubstantiation . . 603

M. Claude's useless denial in opposition to M. Antoine Arnauld . . . 603

## Z. EDWARD STILLINGFLEET, BISHOP OF WORCESTER.

On the necessity of the priest's intention to consecrate . . . . 607

Adoration so becoming idolatry . . . . 608

Cyprian's principle in favour of making no alteration of Christ's rule at all. Therefore against denying the cup to the laity . . . . 608

	PAGE
Excuses against the charge of idolatry examined . . . . .	609
Parallel of Eutychius against the Trinity and Transubstantiation . . . . .	609
The Word was made flesh, treated by them as by Papists, This is My body . . . . .	609
That a body cannot be anywhere without dimensions . . . . .	610
The true mode of interpreting Hilary . . . . .	611
Auricular confession . . . . .	611
 AA. ISAAC BARROW, MASTER OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.	
When signs belong to Divine things they are called sacraments . . . . .	612
A solemn and sensible representation, wherein we behold Him crucified, as it were, in effigie . . . . .	613
Our Lord being absent from us sitting in Heaven at God's right hand . . . . .	613
We in the spiritual intention communicate of His very person, being, according to the manner insinuated, intimately united to Him . . . . .	613
Tasting it by hearty faith, digesting it by careful attention and meditation, converting it into our substance by devout, grateful and holy affections, &c. He that doeth this eats our Saviour's flesh and drinks His blood, &c. . . . .	613
 BB. JOHN TILLOTSON, PRIMATE.	
The Second Council of Nice, 787....The sacrament after consecration is not the image and antitype of Christ's body and blood, but is, properly, the body and blood . . . . .	614
(Transubstantiation) is like a millstone about the neck of Popery, which will sink it at the last . . . . .	615
Our objections against it from the manifold contradictions of it to reason and sense are so many demonstrations of the falsehood of it . . . . .	615
They have nothing to put in the opposite scale but the infallibility of their church, for which there is even less colour of proof from Scripture . . . . .	615
 CC. GEORGE BULL, BISHOP OF ST DAVID'S.	
Nothing doth more alienate the hearts of the Jews and Mahometans too from Christianity than the image worship and bread worship...which they see with their eyes practised by them that call themselves the only true Christians . . . . .	618
Offered not hypostatically, but commemoratively only, not a bare remembering or putting ourselves in mind of Him . . . . .	617
The worst ceremony of all is the elevation of the host to be adored by the people as very Christ himself under the appearance of bread . . . . .	616
These words (those of instituting) could not be true in a proper sense . . . . .	617
The ancient fathers generally teach that the bread and wine in the eucharist, &c. do become and are made the body and blood of Christ....Yet they all declare their sense to be very dissonant from the doctrine of transubstantiation . . . . .	617
They do not all explain themselves the same way . . . . .	617
 DD. ISAAC AMBROSE, THE DUKE OF BEDFORD'S PURITAN CHAPLAIN.	
Union is the ground of communion . . . . .	621
His body and blood are not substantially in us. Christ corporally is only in Heaven. But He is really and spiritually in the spiritual part of us . . . . .	620

	PAGE
The inward nature is upholden in the children of God by things answerable to its nature; and to this indeed...the Lord offers in his sacrament Christ's body and blood as its proper food . . . . .	619
The flesh of Christ is the conduit that conveys the graces of the God-head and the graces of the Spirit of Christ into our souls . . . . .	619
 EE. PASQUIER QUESNEL.	
In this last assembly, an abridgement of the entire church, the Son of God has shewn to us mingled in one, the good the feeble and the wicked, all united under an external profession of the same faith and participating in the same sacraments . . . . .	622
If these words, This is My body, had wanted explanation and could only be understood by a figure, how did Jesus Christ, Himself teaching the apostle this great mystery, and the apostle announcing it to the faithful, leave these words in their obscurity and double meaning? Would not this have been to lead the faithful of all ages into error? . . . . .	624
 FF. PHILIP LIMBORCH.	
Best of the Remonstrant circle of divines; says Luther held, in <i>cum vel sub pane vere et realiter præsens esse et communicantibus tradi et ab ipsis ore vere manducari</i> , i. e. Real presence of the body in the mouths of communicants . . . . .	625
But the way, <i>quo modo</i> , is to us imperscrutable . . . . .	625
This is contrary to the truth of Christ's body, which must be in one certain place . . . . .	626
Luther said, The right hand of God (where His body is) is everywhere . . . . .	626
He took ubiquitarianism from George Calixtus . . . . .	626
If properties of human nature are destroyed it is not a human nature any longer . . . . .	627
 GG. WILLIAM BEVERIDGE, BISHOP OF ST ASAPH.	
Wherein every circumstance represents something of Christ . . . . .	629
Ignorant—such as know not (1) fundamental truths, &c., (2) the state of their own souls, (3) the nature of the sacraments . . . . .	629
The devil took occasion to draw men into an opinion that the bread which is used in that sacrament is the very body that was crucified, &c. . . . .	629
John vi. 63. As though He would have said, Though I do speak of eating My flesh, I would not have you think that My very flesh profiteth anything, or quickeneth . . . . .	630
 IIIH. THOMAS KEN, BISHOP OF BATH AND WELLS, AND ONE OF THE SEVEN.	
First Ed.: How Thou Who art in Heaven art present on the altar, I can by no means explain . . . . .	633
Second: After what extraordinary manner Thou Who art in Heaven art present throughout the whole sacramental action to every devout receiver, &c. I can by no means comprehend, &c. . . . .	633
 II. DANIEL WHITBY, RECTOR OF ST EDMUND, SALISBURY.	
John vi. 52. No one who maintaineth the corporal eating of Christ's flesh to be intended here can, veritably to his own opinion say, that they (the Jews) imposed a false sense on our Saviour's words . . . . .	634
v. 53. Except ye eat, &c. It follows plainly (on this hypothesis) that all the pious and believing Jews who heard these words and died before our Saviour's passion (above a year) must of necessity be (lost) . . . . .	634
Of sacramental eating of Christ's flesh...it was eaten by Judas . . . . .	634
Christ thought His ascension into Heaven sufficient demonstration to the Jews that His flesh could not be eaten upon earth . . . . .	634

	PAGE
This phansy (of Christ's body going through closed doors) destroys not only the end of Christ's then coming to them, but of all that He had said and done to convince them that it was the same body that was crucified that now appeared to them . . . . .	635
<b>JJ. WILLIAM CLAGGETT, RECTOR OF FARNHAM, (IN BISHOP GIBSON.)</b>	
John vi. You may be sure I do not mean that gross feeding upon My flesh and drinking My blood...for My body will soon be too far removed from the conversation of mortal men to be capable of being so used . . . .	636
The flesh profiteth nothing...no not My own flesh. Even this would be but bodily nourishment, but would have no influence on the mind . . . .	636
<b>KK. THOMAS COMBER, DEAN OF DURHAM.</b>	
Let none therefore...imagine we are about to sacrifice Christ again, for this is not only needless but impossible, and in plain contradiction to St Paul, &c. &c. It is only a memorial which the Lord hath delivered unto us instead of a sacrifice. Eusebius . . . . .	637
Let us not startle at the difficulty of this sacramental change . . . .	637
<b>LL. GODFREY WILLIAM LEIBNITZ, PRESIDENT BERLIN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES AND AULIC COUNCILLOR.</b>	
Sacraments, as it were, a peculiar kind of worship and sacred rites instituted by Christ, with the addition of a promise of grace . . . . .	638
The grace is the nourishing of the soul, or the increase of love . . . .	639
It is necessary that the receiving mind be well constituted, lest an obstacle be set in the way (of the benefit) . . . . .	640
It must be confessed that one body cannot be in many places, even by Divine power, any more than a square's diagonal can be of the same length as its side, and that being laid down, we must have recourse to the allegorical mode of interpreting God's word—written or traditive . . . .	641
Christ is now also offering Himself to God the Father for us, through the ministry of the priest . . . . .	648
The sacrifice of the mass the church has always taught to be contained in the sacrament of the eucharist . . . . .	648
<b>MM. FENELON, FRANCIS DE SALIGNAC DE LA MOTHE, ARCHBISHOP OF CAMBRAY.</b>	
It is there (the true body which was on the cross) with His blood shed for our salvation, with His soul, with His Divinity. It is there living immortal, glorious, &c. . . . .	649
It would be useless to abstain from the communion for fear of communicating unworthily; ...in not communicating one deprives one's self of the nourishment and leaves one's self to die of fainting under this privation . . . .	650
On the education of girls. Represent to them the happiness of having been incorporated with Jesus Christ by the eucharist . . . . .	650
Jesus Christ gives His flesh as really as He took it . . . . .	651
<b>NN. RICHARD BAXTER, PASTOR OF KIDDERMINSTER.</b>	
In the consecration we present to our Creator the creatures of bread and wine as we desire, that by His acceptance they may be made, sacramentally and representatively, the body and blood of Christ . . . . .	652
As Christ is now in Heaven representing His sacrifice to the Father, so must the minister of Christ be present, and plead the same sacrifice by way of commemoration and such intercession as belongeth to his office . . . .	653
The minister representing Christ doth by commission deliver His body and blood to the penitent, hungry, believing soul, and with Christ is delivered a sealed pardon of all sin and a sealed gift of life eternal . . . .	653
The naming of the table an altar is no more improper than that other, Heb. xiii. 10, a passage which seems plainly to mean the sacramental communion. [See a correspondence which is to be printed at end of Part I.] . . . .	654

	PAGE
The word priest being used of all Christians that offer praise to God, it may sure be as well used of those whose office it is to be subintercessors between the people and God...In subordination to Christ's priesthood . . .	654
<b>OO. WILLIAM WAKE, PRIMATE.</b>	
Our church utterly denies our Saviour's body to be so really present, &c. as either to leave Heaven or to exist in two several places at the same time	656
We deny, &c. any other substance than that of bread and wine . . .	656
Only a real presence of Christ's invisible power and grace . . .	656
A real sacramental presence of Christ's body and blood in the holy signs, and a real spiritual presence in the inward communion of them to the soul of every worthy receiver. [N.B. Read all this, omitting "real." Is the sense at all changed? Then "real" is better away.] . . .	656
<b>PP. THOMAS WILSON, BISHOP OF THE ISLE OF MAN.</b>	
Who hast called us to this ministry to make us worthy to offer to Thee this sacrifice for our own sins and the sins of Thy people, &c. . . .	660
May I atone unto Thee, O God, by offering unto Thee the pure and unbloody sacrifice which Thou hast ordained by Jesus Christ, &c. . . .	661
The Lord's supper, by which upon your sincere repentance you may obtain the pardon of all your past sins, &c. . . .	661
<b>QQ. JOHN JOHNSON, VICAR OF CRANBROOK.</b>	
They (the priests) believed that they were filled with all that Divine grace and efficacy that the body was . . . .	662
The natural body of Christ...can only be present in the imagination of men, and consequently their eating of it must be only imaginary . . .	663
<b>RR. FRATRES POLONI.</b>	
Remarks on Socinian teaching . . . .	663

## THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

<b>A. PLATON, METROPOLITAN OF MOSCOW.</b>	
The laity seldom partake of the Lord's supper more than once a year; which is always in the great feast before Easter . . . .	665
As soon as an infant is baptized it is admitted to the Lord's supper . . .	665
The communicants receive standing, the bread being sopped in the cup, a little warm water used . . . .	665
<b>B. THE ROMAN PONTIFICATE, OR PONTIFF'S BOOK OF CLEMENT VIII. AND URBAN VIII.</b>	
Consecration of an altar. We beseech that our Lord may bless this stone, on which the oil of sacred unction is poured out, to receive the vows of His own people and the sacrifices, that &c. while we put on it the propitiation of the sacred things, we ourselves may deserve or earn, mereamur, to be the propitiators of God, &c. or God's propitiators, &c. . . .	667
<b>C. PAUL RICAUT, CONSUL AT SMYRNA.</b>	
The grand deceiver who would render that salutiferous food unwholesome and make this principal instrument of grace and salvation to become the most dangerous snare and ruin of human souls . . . .	668
<b>D. JEAN BAPTISTE THIERS, CURÉ OF VIB.</b>	
As the church is conducted by God's Spirit, and is, &c. the pillar and ground of the truth, the ceremonies of the mass which she approves and authorises by use, are in no respect superstitious, because she has received power from Jesus Christ, her Divine Spouse, to establish them . . . .	669



E. DANIEL WATERLAND, ARCHDEACON OF MIDDLESEX. PAGE

Not that I consider that there is any absurdity in supposing a peculiar presence of the Holy Ghost to inanimate things, any more than God's appearing in a burning bush. But there is no proof of the fact, either from direct Scripture or from that in conjunction with the reason of things 670

Some, receding from the latter, have supposed the words, *This is My body*, to mean, *This bread and wine are My body and blood in power and effect, or in virtue and energy*; which is not amiss, except that it seems to carry in it some obscure conception of either an inherent or infused virtue, which is not the truth of the case . . . . . 671

Constructional intermingling . . . . . 671

Under the type of bread you have His body given you, &c. . . . . 672

By this means we carry Christ about with us, inasmuch as His body and blood is distributed to our members . . . . . 672

A sacrifice is properly anything performed for God's due and sole honour, in order to appease Him . . . . . 673

Neither was it a rule that anything material was essential to the nature, notion or definition of a sacrifice . . . . . 673

While we make a sacrifice of our bodies and of our praises to God...the scheme of sacrifice stands, though it be spiritual . . . . . 674

It is pretended that our Lord offered up His sacramental body, *i.e.* the consecrated elements, as a material sacrifice....I find no Scripture proof of this position . . . . . 674

Christ might yea and did offer the elements for consecration (which is very different from sacrificing), or He might present them as signs and figures of a real sacrifice, &c.; but as they were not the real body and blood which they represented, so neither were they the real sacrifice; neither can it be made to appear that they were any sacrifice at all . . . . . 675

## F. BENJAMIN HOADLEY, BISHOP OF WINCHESTER.

To teach that Christians eat His real and natural body in remembrance of His real material body, &c. is to teach that they are to do something in order to remember Him, which supposes Him corporally present, and destroys the very notion of that remembrance, and so directly contradicts the most important words of the institution . . . . . 676

The doctrine of a real sacrifice of Christ's body offered by the priest, &c. contradicts the very words of the institution, in which the remembrance of an absent body broken, not the offering of a present body, is declared to be the end of this religious action . . . . .

The only person who answers to a Jewish priest, considered as a sacrificer, is Jesus Christ, who offered Himself up . . . . . 676

Catechism, "Which are verily and indeed, &c." Very figurative, where figure ought not to have been made use of . . . . . 678

## THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

## A. THOMAS TURTON, BISHOP OF ELY, WHO ANSWERED LORD BROUGHAM AND DR WISEMAN.

Tittmann says, Profane writers use "to eat" and "to drink" of being imbued with the doctrine of any one: but that they so used, to eat the flesh of any one, and to drink the blood of any one, cannot be proved by a single example, &c. . . . . 679

There seems not any further doubt, &c. that the Lord in this place (John vi.) by no means...spake concerning sacramental eating, &c., but rather concerning spiritual eating . . . . . 680

Behold an Israelite indeed, ἀληθῆς, &c. The word is similarly employed John viii. 31. . . . . 680

<b>B. WILLIAM PALMER.</b>	PAGE
No trace of prayer for the Holy Ghost [ <i>i.e.</i> to come down on the bread] in any liturgies of Milan, Italy and Rome . . . . .	681
This prayer (called the prayer of consecration in the Church of England Prayer Book) does not expressly mention the consecration of the elements . . . . .	682
<b>C. JOHN ADAM MOEHLER, PROFESSOR AT MUNICH. THE BEST TEACHER OF MODERN POPEERY.</b>	
A sacrament...(1) a sensual part in religion, (2) pledges or sureties of the Divine will, (3) channels, alvei, &c. . . . .	682
Its Divine matter impregnates the soul, &c. . . . .	683
The church is the living figure of Christ... Whose atoning and redeeming acts it in consequence eternally repeats and uninterruptedly continues . . . . .	683
<b>D. EUGENE HAAG, PROFESSOR AT PARIS.</b>	
They attributed (in early ages) magical effects to the bread and wine, because they were convinced that the Logos was united to it . . . . .	685
The doctrine of an expiatory sacrifice offered by the priests, after the example of the priests of the Jews, spread more and more, and with it ideas more and more favourable to transubstantiation, so that in the seventh Council general, held at Nicæa in 787, it met with an almost unanimous approval . . . . .	686
Haag's survey of the success of Dr Pusey . . . . .	690—1
<b>E. DR LÜCKE, PROFESSOR OF ART HISTORY IN STUTTGART.</b>	
A table in the Church of the Lateran at Rome. No relics in it . . . . .	692
<b>F. ENCYCLOPÆDIC DICTIONARY OF WETZER AND WELTE. FRENCH BY GOSCHLER.</b>	
The eating of the eucharist gives to those that eat it eternal life . . . . .	692
<b>G. DEAN GOODE AND THE TWO ARCHDEACONS WILBERFORCE AND DENISON.</b>	
Archdeacon Wilberforce. The eucharist suggests the order in which spiritual blessings are given out of that sacrament . . . . .	696
Wholly contrary to the fathers. Reference to Waterland . . . . .	696
Archdeacon Wilberforce on John vi. in reply . . . . .	696
Archdeacon Denison's doctrine of the real presence affirmed to be taught by the Church of England in a manner not defined, but that the body and blood are received by all, whether to death or to life . . . . .	697
<i>i. e.</i> To all objectively, to the faithful alone subjectively . . . . .	697
Dean Goode affirms that we cannot receive the <i>virtus sacramenti</i> except by the soul . . . . .	698
Archdeacon Wilberforce's three parts in a sacrament: (1) <i>sacramentum</i> , (2) <i>res sacramenti</i> , (3) <i>virtus sacramenti</i> . . . . .	698
Archdeacon Denison also calling (3) <i>virtus</i> or <i>gratia sacramenti</i> . . . . .	698
Dean Goode. Are the body and blood of Christ received by the soul? . . . . .	698
Ditto. Can "real and spiritual presence" be said to belong to "the presence of a body after the manner of a spirit"? . . . . .	699
Ditto. How can Christ's (organical) body be eaten by faith? . . . . .	700
Ditto. The misuse of passages from our great divines . . . . .	701
<b>H. THE REV. JOHN HARRISON, D.D.</b>	
Interesting controversy with Dr Jacob . . . . .	701
Rules for interpreting the fathers from his latest letter . . . . .	702
Great service rendered . . . . .	702
Consideration of Dr Pusey postponed to Part III. . . . .	703

	PAGE
<b>I. THE RIGHT REV. CONNOP THIRLWALL, D.D., LATELY BISHOP OF ST DAVID'S.</b>	
But we are thus led to ask whether these terms themselves [really and truly] add anything to that which is signified by the word present [ <i>i. e.</i> in relation to a body or any being capable of localization]. For whatever is present anywhere at all must be really and truly present . . . . .	703
There are two senses in which we may speak of the presence of a natural object—the one literal; the other figurative, &c. . . . .	704
Hooker's conclusion objected to . . . . .	704
Sense of Greek word for "do" . . . . .	704
The Council (Trent) does not deny the presence of the natural body in the sacrament, but only that it is there according to its nature and mode of existence . . . . .	704
The dispute between the Franciscans and Dominicans—the one (D) contending that the body of Christ was translated from Heaven into the sacrament; the other (F) that it was created by each consecration . . . . .	705—6
Mr C.'s confusion between a presence and the mode of a presence . . . . .	706
Bellarmino says, We shall not say that the body of Christ in the eucharist is sensible, visible, tangible, extended, though in Heaven it is such. Also, We shall say that Christ is in the eucharist truly, really, substantially, as the Council rightly says; but we shall not say corporeally; <i>i. e.</i> in that manner in which bodies exist of their own nature, sensibly, movably, &c. . . . .	707
<b>K. THE REV. EDWARD MEYRICK GOULBURN, D.D., DEAN OF NORWICH.</b>	
A sad tendency in the human mind to localize and materialize the blessings of this ordinance...placing the blessing entirely in the outward and visible sign—the imagining some mysterious charm, a virtue half physical, half spiritual, to reside in the...bread and the wine. Compare Neander on Century IV. . . . .	709
The Laudian doctrine of consecration is quite as much open to the charge as the bolder and more unreasonable error of the church of Rome . . . . .	709
The sacred loaf which represents and conveys the body of Christ is one; and a portion of it, after it has been broken, passes into each communicant, who hereupon is made one with the body of Christ or Christian society . . . . .	710
The distinctively Christian ordinance . . . . .	708
Communicating to the soul after an Heavenly and spiritual manner—the very body and blood of our crucified Redeemer . . . . .	708
<b>L. LANGE'S COMMENTARY (BIBELWERK).</b>	
Romanist Lutherans teach...that unbelievers sacramentally eat, &c. The orthodox Lutherans for this reason repudiated the sacramental interpretation of John vi., not (Tholuck) from fear of transubstantiation . . . . .	713
<b>M. THOMAS VOGAN, RECTOR OF WALBERTON.</b>	
The letter and the interpretation of that letter is that the bread—is—the body, and that the wine—is—the blood of Christ...of that body He said, It was being broken for you, and of that blood He said, it was being shed for you . . . . .	716
The bread and the wine are the body and blood of Christ as far as one thing can be another . . . . .	716
The bread is His body as a sacrifice, His dead body . . . . .	718
This demand of a literal construction is just . . . . .	716
He speaks of His dead body . . . . .	715
Undoubtedly and most fully a real and objective presence in a certain sense of the Lord's body and blood, <i>i. e.</i> of the things which He called, and ordained to be, sacramentally His body and blood . . . . .	715
<b>N. THE LATE REV. HOBART SEYMOUR, OF BATH.</b>	
In the 40 days, Acts i. 3, no allusion to the Lord's supper, &c. . . . .	719

A revolution is advancing with great rapidity, that the frequency of attendance at the Lord's supper is a precious and weighty engine of grace for converting the communicant and advancing the growth of religious life	718
The moment we leave the Holy Scriptures, &c. there is no limit to the information, &c. of the frequency of communion . . . . .	719
The church of Rome has no desire for frequent communions, holding that the members of each congregation do virtually communicate...in the priest that celebrates . . . . .	719—20
The number of celebrations must be sufficient for the convenience and exigencies of the parishioners, as their special necessities require in the morning, in the afternoon, or in the evening . . . . .	720
With these frequent celebrations the preaching of the gospel must be sadly curtailed...already too many not preaching on the days of celebration . . . . .	720
O. THE REV. GEORGE ANDREW JACOB, D.D., LATE MASTER OF CHRIST'S HOSPITAL.	
It needs only...to remove whatever encourages the thought that a Christian presbyter is a priest, and as such possesses that power of granting priestly absolution, offering sacrifices, or of performing any other mediatorial work for Christian men . . . . .	721
There has been at all times a close connexion between the estimation and use of the Christian sacraments and the views entertained of the Christian ministry . . . . .	721
The sacrament of the Lord's supper was the most simple of all ordinances in the apostolic church. No idea of a sacrifice was attached to its celebration; no change was supposed to take place in the sacred elements; no virtue to be imparted to them through the administrator; no presence of Christ in them or with them in any especial manner . . . . .	721
In the post-apostolic church all this was gradually changed . . . . .	722
The doctrine of the earlier period differed from mediæval Romanism on this point (superstitions in this sacred rite) in scarcely anything beyond the use of another and synonymous word . . . . .	722
P. THE LATE REV. R. W. MARRIOTT, OF ETON SCHOOL.	
In the Christian memorial of the sacrifice on the cross the passover is not destroyed but fulfilled . . . . .	723
Rule as to the use of <i>τοῦτο</i> generally . . . . .	723—4
Rule as to the meaning of "is" . . . . .	724
The bread is (virtute et affectu) My body . . . . .	724
Q. THE REV. WILLIAM E. SCUDAMORE.	
The Eucharist . . . . .	725—6
Real and essential presence was, in the scholastic language of the Reformers, equivalent to the corporal presence . . . . .	727
Our Lord's own words are not by themselves decisive. This is My body, might, without any violation of Scriptural analogy, mean no more than, This is a figure of My body . . . . .	728
Guilty of the body and blood, &c. The plain inference is that the body and blood of Christ are present, &c. . . . .	728
His sacred body: but there it is, nevertheless, before us . . . . .	728
That body therefore is most truly present, offering itself to the spiritual perception, &c. . . . .	728
We may be disposed to regret that the use of a prayer expressly asking for the action of the Holy Ghost on the elements was not universal . . . . .	728
R. THE REV. CANON RYLE, COMMENTARY ON ST JOHN'S GOSPEL.	
St John vi. 31. Possible senses and a judgment as a key to the whole chapter . . . . .	729—30

<b>S. A NORWICH TRACT, BIOGRAPHICAL.</b>	PAGE
He had, of course, his altar and his sacrifice of the body and blood which he offered to God, considering that this was an extension or continuation of the sacrifice of Christ on the cross, that he as priest on earth was doing what Christ is [by such persons] supposed to be doing in Heaven, offering sacrifice. This was the central doctrine or point of his system . . . . .	730
<b>T. THE THEORY OF CONSECRATION, BY H. H. EDINBURGH.</b>	
Dr Neale wishes the invocation put after the oblation . . . . .	731
The oblation implies that the sacrifice of the New Testament is now pleaded for us before the throne and altar on high . . . . .	731
The invocation, &c. follows, because the next step [in the Mosaic ritual] was to place the victim on the altar and burn it. This is the type of that conversion whereby the fire of the Holy Ghost does not consume but trans- element earthly things into Heavenly. To alter the order is to spoil it . . . . .	732
Hoc est corpus Meum. What is the hoc? Is it bread or not? No Roman theologian can determine, though many have tried. Dogmatically it is not. In the order of time it is, &c. . . . .	732
This insurmountable difficulty it is which caused the rubrical order that the celebrant should say all the words of consecration in one breath—as though that tied subject and predicate together, without intermission of time . . . . .	732
<b>U. THE CAPEL LIDDON CONTROVERSY IN THE "TIMES," 1875.</b>	
Canon Liddon. Believing...that the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed, &c., we necessarily believe in the Real Presence of Christ in that sacrament, &c. &c. But we reject the Roman explanation of His presence—transubstantiation, &c. . . . .	733
Monsignor Capel. The catechetical notes of Dr Neale. All matter is divided into the accidents and substance, &c. &c. "Bread into His flesh is "turned" is the usual way (with Ritualists) to express transubstantiation. In the 'Night Hours,' &c. Bread and wine are substantially changed into the body and blood of Christ. In 1865 'The Priest to the Altar' published. Before the usual (Church of England) words of consecration is inserted, "Send down Thy Holy Spirit on this sacrifice that He may make this bread "the body of Thy Christ." Much about the Virgin Mary a little after . . . . .	734
Canon Liddon. The work an honest Church of England work, &c. . . . .	735
That phrase is patristic and therefore Anglican . . . . .	735
The bread has ceased to be bread. Christ's body only is really here . . . . .	735
The senses which tell me that what I see touch and taste is still sub- stantial cannot be trusted . . . . .	735
<b>V. SUMMARY OBSERVATIONS . . . . .</b>	736—7

## TWO APPENDICES.

- I. LECTURE AT NORWICH: "IS THERE NOT A CAUSE?" WITH SOME LETTERS.
- II. A PAPER READ AT A LARGE CLERICAL MEETING IN 1876, WITH A LETTER ADDRESSED TO THE CHAIRMAN.

## FOUR ALPHABETICAL INDICES

TO FACILITATE REFERENCE

- I. To every Father or Author from whom Citations are made.
- II. To very many of the Doctrinal Statements and of the Terms used.
- III. To Events or other Facts mentioned.
- IV. To Passages of Holy Scripture that are commented on by the various writers.

## THE TENTH CENTURY.

(A.) ÆLFRIC OR ELFRIC OR ALFRIC. D. 1006.

THE lights of early English church history shine very brightly in the intervals between the fierce raids of the robber bands from the North-West of Europe. First we can well believe that Bede and his followers spread a kind of day around them in the seventh and eighth centuries. Then what wonders were wrought by that bright star of God, King Alfred, who went to battle with the book of Psalms in his bosom, and whose aim was set at no lower point than to provide books in his people's own tongue, by which they might become intelligent Christians. His reign closed just after the end of the ninth century (901). Then in the tenth century the eye rests on a Dunstan and an Ethelwold, who worked for clerical reform in particular, but included seculars with monks in their schools. This brings us to the Ælfric, who was a disciple of the latter. He certainly shines out as one of the lights of the age. I have set down no designation of title or of position. In fact it is from the very advanced character of his testimony that a dispute has arisen, which, in the opinion of the late Chancellor of St Paul's, Henry Soames, makes his having risen to the position of primate or even of bishop extremely uncertain. And yet one of the passages that will be cited gives internal evidence of a rule over a more numerous body of clergy and of a different kind from what a mere abbot would have had. He began by being abbot of Cerne, Dorset; and some think he became abbot of Peterborough, because he is said to have been buried there. But this I leave. His fame stands on the higher foundation of having widely promoted the preaching of sermons, by having translated ancient homilies of the chief fathers into Anglo-Saxon, sufficient for the

circle of a year. He then added a second set; and in all this he had the warm approval of Sigeric the primate. It is perhaps well to state that upon this fact and a concurrence of others looking in the same direction Henry Soames maintains, that the British church for a considerable period maintained doctrine on the Lord's supper much more in harmony with our own than was then held in the Continental churches in general—an argument, which makes for the justice of the financial rearrangements of the English Reformation, and stamps modern Romanizers as so far declining from the doctrine of their Anglo-Saxon forefathers. But I return to the translated homilies of Ælfric: and I cannot but remark that he inherited the spirit of the great Alfred, who also employed Asser and others to give to his subjects some of the chief ancient treatises in their own tongue if he did not translate some himself. And as the hot controversy about Ælfric's church position has been mentioned, another equally vehement dispute may be alluded to, viz. whether the John mentioned in Asser, as brought into England from France to help Alfred in elevating the religious condition of his people, was or was not John Scotus Erigena; and on this point the arguments on the affirmative side seem to have the balance of evidence in their favour. All this certainly adds much to the interest that attaches to the citations from Ælfric on the Lord's supper.

The account of Elfric that is given in the *Dictionnaire Universel* is that he was archbishop of Canterbury, and that he acquired a great reputation in the tenth century among the Saxons: that he translated into their language the first books of the Holy Scripture, a church history, and 180 sermons; and that we have from him, yet surviving, a grammar and a dictionary (of that tongue). The time and place of his birth are alike unknown.

The readers of my late friend Dean Goode's book on the Eucharist, cannot fail to have noticed that he hardly knows what estimate to form of the utterances of the early fathers in general—whether to declare their strong expressions on the Lord's supper to be affirmative of the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in this sacrament or no. The early English Reformers, whose own ideas were not all clear, felt the same doubt. Fox, who must be numbered amongst them, and who received assistance towards his great work from bishops and men of high note, felt the same perplexity: and in Vol. II. p. 371, ed. Lond.

1684, he brings in the Saxon Elfric in the midst of a cloud of witnesses, whom he labours to prove clear of the essentials of corrupt belief on this subject. With what imperfect success he pleads can be indeed discerned from his own citations alone: but the point cannot I think be really settled with a less abundance of quotation than I have brought forward in these volumes. As to Fox's citations, take the first from St Ambrose, "Ut sint quæ erant *et in aliud convertantur*," &c. His list of authors includes that eclipsed luminary, Johannes Scotus, whose book on this subject, as has been stated, perished after being condemned in the eleventh century at Vercelli. After Osberne and Odo, Fox comes to Elfric. Migne makes Alfric Primate A.D. 996, and for ten years.

*The Letter to Wulfrine, Bishop of Sherborne.*

"Men shall reserve more carefully that holy housel, and not reserve it too long; but hallow other of new for sick men, always, within a week or a fortnight, so that it be not so much as hoary" (white with mildew). "For so holy is the housel, which to-day is hallowed as that which on Easter-day was hallowed." (All this overthrew the general custom of keeping the consecrated bread of Easter-day to be ministered to the sick, instead of newly-consecrated bread and wine.) "That housel is Christ's body *not bodily*, but ghostly: *not the body which He suffered in*; but the body of which He spake when He blessed bread and wine to housel the night before His suffering, and said by the blessed bread, 'This is My body,' and again by the holy wine, 'This is My blood which is shed for many in the forgiveness of sins'" (he puts "in" for *eis*, "unto"). "Understand now the Lord who could *turn that bread* before His suffering to *His body* and that wine to His blood, *ghostly*; that the same Lord blesseth daily, through the priest's hands, bread and wine to His ghostly body and to His ghostly blood." (We see here the dawning of Protestant truth, but it does not seem to me clear of all darkness. From another letter to the same). "I beseech you to keep the holy body of Christ with more advisement, for sick men, from Sunday to Sunday in a very clean box, or at the most not to keep it above a fortnight and then eat it, laying other in the place, &c. Some priests will not eat the housel which they hallow. But we will now declare unto you how the holy book speaketh by them. A presbyter celebrating mass and not daring to take *the sacrifice* (sacrificium) through his conscience accusing him, is anathema. It is less danger to receive the housel than to hallow it. He that doth twice hallow one Host to housel is like unto those heretics who do christen twice one child ... That lively bread is



not *bodily* so—not the self-same body that Christ suffered in; nor that holy wine is the Saviour's blood (which was shed for us); *not in bodily thing but in ghostly understanding* (before said to be) "in ghostly mystery. Both be truly. That bread is His body and that wine also is His blood—as was the heavenly bread which we call manna, that fed 40 years God's people. And the clear water which did then run from the stone in the wilderness was truly His blood, 1 Cor. x. &c. The apostle saith all our fathers did eat in the wilderness the same ghostly meat, &c. And he saith not bodily but ghostly. And Christ was not yet born nor His blood shed when that the people of Israel did eat that meat and drank of that stone: and the stone was not bodily Christ, though he so said. It was the same mystery in the old law, and they did ghostly signify that ghostly housel which we consecrate now."

*A Fragment in the Worcester Library.*

"Notwithstanding, the sacrifice is not His body in which He suffered for us, nor His blood which He shed for us, but it is made (efficitur—equivalent to Jerome's conficitur) His body and blood spiritually, as the manna which rained down from heaven, and the water which flowed down from the rock. As Paul, &c."

*From a Sermon translated by Elfric from Latin to Saxon.*

"Why is then the housel called Christ's body, or His blood, *if it be not truly* what it is called? ... Without they be seen bread and wine both in figure and taste and *they be truly*, after their hallowing, Christ's body and blood, through ghostly mystery." And much more. "Much is betwixt the invisible might of the holy housel and the visible shape of proper nature... If we behold the holy housel after bodily understanding, then we see that it is a creature corruptible and mutable. If we knowlege *therein* ghostly might, then understand we that life is therein, and that it giveth immortality to them that eat with belief." [A sentence which Cyril of Alexandria himself might have written.] "Therefore is that holy housel called a mystery, because there is one thing in it seen and another understood. That which is there seen hath bodily shape; and that we do there understand hath ghostly might... That housel is temporal not eternal—corruptible, &c. Howbeit nevertheless after ghostly might it is in every part... This mystery is a pledge and a figure. Christ's body is truth itself ... Truly it is, so as we before have said, Christ's body and blood: not bodily but ghostly." [I confess I should like a clearer guide to conduct me home through a dark night.] "Once suffered Christ Himself, but yet nevertheless His suffering is daily renewed

at His supper through mystery of the holy housel. Therefore we ought to consider diligently how that this holy housel is both Christ's body, and the body of all faithful men after a ghostly sort."

With that, as with a somewhat favourable ending, our extracts may close without further comment upon this excellent man, who certainly rises above his own time in this respect—living a good part of a century before the great controversy of the church with Berengar, and probably not having seen the writings of John Scotus on this subject, and perhaps not even that of Ratram, but being a partaker of the light that was then shooting forth out of the cloudy firmament of general opinion.

(B.) GERBERT, POPE SYLVESTER II. D. 1003.

This prelate was the first Frenchman who was made Pope: he rose to the highest from the lowest. The data of his birth are not known; but he wittily condensed his own history into one line,

Scandit ab R Gerbertus in R; post, Papa vigens R.

The first R is Rheims. The decree for his election to it by the bishops of the province says, that they have known him from a boy, and praises him highly. (The line cannot embrace another R, viz. that his patron was his king Robert, to whom he had been tutor.) Rheims cathedral is said to owe much to his liberality. The second R in the verse is Ravenna, and to this he was raised by Pope Gregory V. The third R is Rome, to which he was elevated by the influence of his other Royal pupil, Otho III. Fulbert, and Richer, who wrote a history of France in four volumes, were trained by his hand. He was skilled in practical mathematics, and was great at clock-making, regulating their time by the motion of the stars, as observed through a tube. No wonder he was credited with skill in magic arts and with having a demon to attend upon him. There was peril then in being a material philosopher. No doubt like Michael Scott he suffered from like secretly whispered accusations: and it is likely that men said, that

When in studious mood he paced  
 Saint Remo's cloistered hall,  
 His form no darkening shadow traced  
 Upon the sunny wall.

But, in fact, he wrote on numbers, geometry, and the celestial sphere, and on the dictates and use of reason. Letters also before and after his elevation to the popedom survive.

There was a party in favour of Arnulf who had been deposed from the bishopric of Rheims: and Gerbert was for a time deposed that Arnulf might be restored. This was done at the second council at Rheims in 996. It seems that in order to be restored Gerbert gave in to Papal Supremacy, and acknowledged the forged decrees audaciously palmed on Isidore. But there still remains the question how he steered his course, so as to please both the Pope in order to get Ravenna, and the Emperor so as to obtain the Popedom afterwards. His writings shew a man of great self-confidence and rather hasty judgment. But it is hard to say to what extent he compromised himself.

The high walks of the world are slippery places to an ambitious mind. His letter in reappointing Arnulf to Rheims either shews an easiness of belief in the Pope's assumptions of some of the Divine attributes, or it betrays something worse than credulity. Milman writes with witty sarcasm concerning the terror felt by many strong Papalists, not lest this Pope was mendacious, but lest—horror beyond all horrors—the throne of St Peter was in his case occupied by a necromancer. However, if he *did* invent “an organ that acted by steam,” he gave full sanction to the second missionary to the Prussian barbarians, i.e. Bruno, the second Boniface, who went with a chosen band thither, and all perished. That he struck the first signal for the rescue of the holy land from the infidel the XXVIIIth of the letters that survive him plainly declares. The title of the letter is “From the person “of devastated Jerusalem to the universal church,” and it begins, “The church which is at Jerusalem to the universal church that “commands the sceptres of the kingdoms.” After shewing forth the claims of the holy territory to general regard, he quotes Isaiah xi. 10, “His *sepulchre* shall be glorious,” and adds, “The devil tries to “render it inglorious, while the pagans subvert the holy places.” Then the pope blows the trumpet call, “Strive forth, therefore, “O soldier of Christ, be standard-bearer and companion to me “(Jerusalem) in war, &c., &c.”

Gerbert, however, died too early to realize his scheme of a universal league of Christendom for this end. When the monumental tomb of this pope in St John Lateran was opened in 1648,

his body was seen in a coffin of marble, clothed in the papal robes and with his arms crossed: but the air immediately acted on them, they fell to dust; and nothing remained but a silver cross and the Pope's episcopal ring.

Auvergne was the region of his birth, the convent of Aurillac the place of his education, and Raymond, who afterwards became abbot, was his teacher. Claudius (Claude) bishop of Turin was his enlightened contemporary.

P. 1. "On the body and blood of Christ. As a certain wise man said before our time, Because the animal man perceives not the things that are of the Spirit of God, we vehemently hesitate lest, living with too little spirituality, when we are preparing answers on spiritual subjects, such as perhaps we do not yet apprehend, we fall on some stone of stumbling and rock of offence. But again, when we direct our inner look to Him Who said, 'Open thy mouth, and I will fill it,' Ps. lxxx., our integrity of faith remaining in us, we are stimulated to respond upon these points, on which we ought not to be silent, that is to say concerning the Lord's body and blood; as some persons say that that which is received from the altar is the same as that (body) which was born of the virgin; but others deny and say that it is different; but some with an inspiration from the devil, blasphemously saying that it goes through the same changes as other food.... Against those who dogmatize on the subject, whatever shall be said concerning the Lord's body—either that is said in truth or in a figure, and so in a shadow, &c., &c."

The material philosopher advocates indifference in opposition to the strife between Radbert and Ratram and Raban, and he quotes the fathers: but he rather favours Radbert, *i.e.* Paschasius.

*De corpore et sanguine Christi. Migne, p. 1.*

Sicut ante nos dixit quidam sapiens,... "Quia animalis homo non "percipit ea quæ sunt Spiritus Dei," hæsitamus vehementer ne, minus spiritualiter viventes, cum de spiritualibus responsa paramus qualia forte nec dum percipimus, in lapidem offensionis et petram scandalii incidamus. Sed iterum cum internum aspectum ad Eum dirigimus, Qui dixit "Aperi os tuum, et Ego adimplebo illud" (Ps. lxxx. 11), fidei integritate manente, provocamur respondere de quo dignum est non tacere, de mysterio videlicet corporis et sanguinis Domini: dicentibus quibusdam idem esse, quod sumitur de altari quod et illud, quod est ex virgine natum; aliis autem negantibus et dicentibus aliud esse; quibusdam autem diabolica inspiratione blasphemantibus secessui obnoxium fore... Contra eos qui dogmatissant, quicquid de corpore Domini dicitur, *vel in veritate, vel in figurâ* [ac per hoc in umbra] dici, &c.

We have noted Hilary as the first specific asserter of the real natural presence of Christ's body in the Lord's supper. The following is from Hilary.

P. 184. "No place is left for doubting about the truth of (Christ's) flesh and blood, John vi. For now by the confession of our Lord Himself and by our faith it is truly flesh and truly blood: and these two received and drunk make us to be in Christ and Christ in us. Is not this the truth? It may certainly happen to be not true in the opinion of those who stoutly deny the Godhead of Jesus. He therefore Himself is in us by His flesh and we are in Him, while this, which we are, is with Himself in God, &c. It was therefore past doubt... that the Word was truly made flesh. And none the less, since God (Christ) by being born a man has taken to Himself the nature of our flesh inseparable from Him. He has also mingled the flesh of His own nature with His eternal nature under this sacrament for communicating His flesh to us, and by this we are being made one body in Christ; and therefore through this we are all one (body) in God the Father and in the Son, since the Father is in Christ and Christ is proved to be in us. Let us see the (exact) distinction. Christ took the nature of our flesh when He was born of the Virgin and came forth a man." [This "came forth" is equal to proceeded, i.e. came from God into the world. This is the way in which the term *ἐκπορεύεσθαι παρὰ* is used regarding the Son.] "Behold! the flesh from the virgin (given us) under the sacrament for communicating (His) flesh!"

---

P. 184, *John VI.*

He quotes Hilary for one in his own treatise "De corpore et sanguine Domini." "De veritate carnis et sanguinis non est relictus ambigendi locus (i.e. after John vi.). Nunc enim et professione Ipsius Domini et fide nostrâ vere caro est et vere sanguis est: atque hæc accepta atque hausta id efficiunt ut nos in Christo et Christus in nobis sit. Anne hoc veritas non est? Contingat plane his verum non esse, qui Christum Jesum verum esse Deum denegant (i.e. to Socinians, &c.). Est ergo in nobis Ipse *per carnem* et sumus in Eo, dum Secum hoc, "quod nos sumus, in Deo est," &c., and Gerbert says... Indubitatum erat... quod vere Verbum caro factum fuerat. *Nihilominus*, quia Deus naturam carnis nostræ inseparabilem Sibi, homo natus, assumpsit, et naturam carnis Suae ad naturam æternitatis sub sacramento hoc nobis *communicandæ carnis* admiscuit, ac per hoc nos in Christo unum corpus efficimur; et ideo per hoc omnes in Deo Patre et Filio unum sumus; quia Pater in Christo, et Christus in nobis esse probatur. Videamus distinctionem. Christus naturam nostræ carnis assumpsit, cum de virgine natus homo processit. Ecce caro de virgine sub sacramento *communicandæ carnis*. Ecce quod sumitur de altari ad naturam æternitatis nos univit. Ecce

Behold! that which is received from the altar united us to His eternal nature. Behold our body, which is the church! Now I believe that the truth is open, as the blessed Ambrose had said that it at length is, that this should be understood in its natural sense; and Augustine, Jerome, and Fulgentius (think that it is open), to be understood in a special (spiritual) sense also...

P. 186. "None has ascended into Heaven with His flesh except He that came down with His Godhead. For for this end He was made partaker of our manhood by assuming our flesh from the virgin; that we, *i.e.* His church, made partakers of His Divinity, might be united by Him with His body that was taken from the virgin, the eucharist, which is received from the altar, acting as the medium and confirming the union. [Note. I have changed the voice of the verb in order to preserve the order of the words] ... He has mingled the nature of His own flesh with His eternal nature under the sacrament for communicating His flesh ...

P. 187. "There are not on this account many productions of flesh, or many bodies, as neither are there many sacrifices but one (only), although it be offered by many (priests) through a variety of places and times. Since the Divinity of the Word of God, which is one, both fills all places, and is all-present in every place, that Divinity itself causes that there should not be many sacrifices but only one ... and that the body of Christ (in the supper) should be one with that which He took from the virgin's womb."

corpus nostrum, quod est ecclesia! Jam credo patere, quod beatus Ambrosius dixerat tandem esse, ut subaudiatur naturaliter: et Augustinus Hieronymus et Fulgentius, ut subaudiatur specialiter.

P. 186.

Nemo ascendit in cælum cum carne nisi qui descendit cum Deitate. Ad hoc enim particeps factus est humanitatis nostræ assumendo carnem nostram de virgine; ut nos, id est ecclesiam, particeps factos Divinitatis Suae *uniret corpori Suo*, sumpto de virgine, eucharistiâ, quæ sumitur de altari, *mediante* et confirmante...naturam carnis Suae ad naturam æternitatis sub sacramento communicandæ carnis admiscuit. [Note this includes *all* the visible church bad and good. This is what the great philosopher has made of it.]

P. 187.

Non ob hoc plures carnes vel corpora, sicut nec multa sacrificia sed unum, licet a multis offeratur per loca diversa et tempora. Quia Divinitas Verbi Dei, quæ una est et omnia replet et tota ubique est Ipsa facit ut non plura sint sacrificia sed unum...et sit unum corpus Christi cum illo quod suscepit de utero virginali. [Thus Gerbert gives in to the fallacy that Christ's *body* is everywhere, because His *Godhead* is everywhere.]

## THE ELEVENTH CENTURY.

(A.) CARDINAL PETER DAMIANI, BISHOP OF OSTIA.

B. 1007. D. 1077.

I FEAR that we must, according to the judgment of the greatest modern ecclesiastical historian, brand this man as "a zealot." But he was a sincere enemy of vice. The two vices against which he directed his whole strength were (1) sins against the seventh commandment in nearly the entire body of the clergy, and (2) the simoniacal sale and purchase of clerical preferments. So far he was on the side of right: but his way of remedying the latter seems to have been to exalt papal and clerical, and to distrust lay power; and as for his remedy for the former, it was in direct opposition to St Paul's significant precept, that the bishop (including the presbyter) be husband of one wife. And what has ever been the result of forbidding the clergy to marry? One cannot particularize their secret, and in point of open general understanding of the truth, their public entanglements. Suffice it to say that they are affirmed to have been stained even to the blackness of the Turk. Is it wonderful that Damiani and Hildebrand and his predecessor, Gregory VI., and at a much earlier date Leo, were ready to introduce desperate remedies, and to think that the only hope of society lay in pushing these remedies to the utmost extremity possible? One hot-headed zealot, like Damiani, might carry all before him. The two floods of corruption were undeniably all but universal. Against the one, universal clerical celibacy was to present a high example to the laity: and against the other universal clerical influence was to form the basis of a grand universal clerical struggle, (1) against all lay control, and (2) in the pursuit of hierarchal supremacy in everything. A pure self-denying clergy, raised to the highest pitch of power, might, it was thought, restore even lay morality and change the face of all

Christendom. Such was the original aim of Damiani and Hildebrand. It is very easy after the event to say in full wisdom, that they erred, "not knowing" either the Scriptures or the nature of man. But their errors were hoary with age, having arisen at early dates. There was abundance of high sanction for them. It might seem that all that was needed was their universal and thorough application. At least those great men would say "There is nothing else to be tried." So the steam was raised to its highest power, and the merciless car set in full motion, and the result has left the name of Gregory the Seventh as the enemy of the human race in reference to those things; a deliverance from which in the Reformation period did give to Christendom those true principles of amendment, that are the very opposite of what these leaders tried in their despair. It is some consolation—though it utters a warning voice also—that these men began with "a zeal for God," but not according to revealed truth. And the warning voice to us is, that we must not go back to their fully exploded errors.

Damian claims to have been born of parents that were respectable (honestis) at Ravenna, though poor. But the marvels of his infancy when cast off by his mother, and the multitude of marvelous things that were done for him and those that were afterwards done by him we may pass over. There are several lives of him and many notices respecting him: but Petrarch, who sent to the retirement in Umbria, at which Damian had lived, gained little certain knowledge but this, that Damian became a monk before he was made Cardinal and Bishop; and that before the close of his life, he returned to the monastic life. Thus it seems to have been with him as with one of our own true poets, that in all the grandeur of success in public life, his eye was set on returning to the point from which he started, and that he came to it a sadder and a wiser man, having learned much regarding his own mistakes and done much that caused him sorrow, to lie down in his original place of rest, "and die at home at last." There is something in this that speaks to our hearts in these brighter days of ours.

He wrote the lives of several noted monks, to present in them models of solitary living, which he loved: but his strength was put forth in his letters, and in the two books of Gratissimus, regarding the simonizing clergy; and in Gomorrhianus against the other class of sins. But his glory lies in his having person-



ally studied all Scripture, as is shewn in the Index of Passages commented on: and it is not a little remarkable that his comment, Vol. II. p. 93, upon St John xx. 23, on remitting and retaining sins, is so far from ignoring the fact that other than the apostles were present with them when those words were uttered and when Christ breathed on them, that he inclines to the same mode of interpreting them, and that he so takes the first coming extract regarding the consecration of the bread and wine in the supper, that it is to be regarded as an utterance belonging to the whole church. Such a man in other days might have borne a Protestant character. The place of his retirement was by the Fons Avellana; that of his death was Forenza. But one of the lives places this Avella in the Catrian mount in Umbria: while the common Avella (Abella) is in Campania near Sorrento, on the dulcissima Campaniæ ora.

P. 99. "For this is the reason why, in the actual celebration of the masses, when it is said, 'Remember, Lord, Thy servants and Thy handmaidens,' it is soon after subjoined, 'for whom we offer to Thee,' or, 'who offer to Thee this sacrifice of praise.' For in these words it is openly shewn that the sacrifice of praise is offered by all the faithful, not men only but women also, although it seems to be offered by one priest specially: because what he handles in offering it to God, this the multitude of the faithful with their minds in intent devotion commend to God. And this is there declared when it is said, 'This oblation then of our service (we offer), but also all Thine household, which we are, 'O Lord, that thou mayest be propitiated and receive it.' And by this it is proved as clear as light, that what is put on the sacred altar, by the priests, is really offered by the whole household of

---

*Dominus Vobiscum, Vol. III. c. VIII. p. 99. Paris, 1642.*

Hinc est enim, quod in ipsâ celebratione missarum, cum dicitur, "Memento, Domine, famulorum Tuorum famularumque Tuarum," paulo post subditur, "pro quibus Tibi offerimus," vel, "qui Tibi offerunt hoc sacrificium laudis." In quibus verbis patenter ostenditur, quod a cunctis fidelibus non solum viris, sed etiam mulieribus sacrificium laudis illud offertur, licet ab uno specialiter offerri sacerdote videatur: quia, quod ille Deo offerendo manibus tractat, hoc multitudo fidelium intentâ mentium devotione commendat. Quod illic quoque declaratur ubi dicitur, "Hanc igitur oblationem servitutis nostræ, sed et cuncta familia Tua, quæ sumus, Domine, ut placatus accipias." Quibus verbis luce clarius constat, quod a sacerdote sacris altaribus superponitur, a cunctâ Dei familiâ generaliter offeratur. Hanc autem

God generally. But the Apostle 1 Cor. x. manifestly declares this unity, We being many are one body, one bread. For so great is the church's unity in Christ, that there is but one bread of the body of Christ in the whole circle of the world and but one cup of His blood. Since as the Deity of the Word of God is one, and yet it fills the whole world, so although that body be consecrated in many places and on many days, yet there are not many bodies of Christ but one body. And as that bread and blood have truly passed into Christ's body, so all that worthily receive it in church become without doubt one body of Christ, as Christ Himself testifies, when He says, John vi., He that eateth my flesh, &c. If therefore we all are one body, even though in bodily appearance we seem to be disjoined, yet we who remain in Him cannot be separated from one another. I do not see what can hurt us, if we do but individually hold to the general church's custom, since we have never withdrawn from the sacrament of individual oneness in the use of it. For when I alone put forth the church's words, I am shewing that I am one with her, and that I by the Spirit's presence truly abide in her, and if I am truly a member of her, I do not inconsistently with this idea fill up the function of my universality. For as a man is in Greek speech called a microcosm, because in material essence man is made of the same four elements, of which this universal world is made, so each one of the faithful seems to be as it were a lesser church, &c. Why should one be prohibited from, as one alone putting forth the church's words, &c."

---

*ecclesiæ unitatem apostolus manifeste declarat, 1 Cor. x., "Unum corpus "unus panis multi sumus." Tanta enim est ecclesiæ unitas in Christo, ut unus ubique in toto orbe terrarum sit panis corporis Christi, et unus calix sanguinis Ejus. Quoniam sicut Divinitas Verbi Dei una est, quæ totum implet mundum, ita licet multis locis multisque diebus illud corpus consecratur, non sunt tamen multa corpora sed unum corpus Christi. Et sicut ille panis et sanguis in corpus Christi veraciter transierunt, ita omnes, qui illud in ecclesiâ digne accipiunt, unum absque dubio Christi corpus fiunt, Ipso testante, cum ait (John vi), "He that eateth My flesh," &c. Si ergo omnes unum Christi corpus sumus, et licet per corporalem speciem videamur abjungi, spiritu tamen ab invicem separari non possumus, qui in Eo manemus. Quid noceat, ego non video, si communem ecclesiæ consuetudinem et singuli teneamus, qui per unitatis individux sacramentum ab eâ nunquam recepimus. Cum enim ecclesiæ verba solus profero, cum eâ me esse unum ac per præsentiam Spiritus in eâ me veraciter manere demonstro; et si Ejus sum veraciter membrum, non inconvenienter adimpleo meæ universitatis officium. C. xi. p. 100... Sicut enim homo Græco eloquio dicitur microcosmus, hoc est, minor mundus, quoniam per materialem essentiam eisdem quatuor elementis homo constat, quibus universalis hic mundus; ita etiam unusquisque fidelium quasi quædam videtur minor esse ecclesiæ, &c. &c. Cur prohibeatur communia ecclesiæ solus verba proferre, &c.*

P. 41. "Even a bad man can receive the sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord, 1 Cor. xi.: for it is of such that it is said, &c. Even a bad man can bear Christ's name; i.e. even a bad man can be called a Christian. They polluted the name of their own God. Therefore even a bad man can have all the sacraments (administered to him).

P. 55. "For it is said by them that what till their time seemed to be a church was only a house: what was believed to be an altar was mere stone; that priests and men distinguished with other orders were wholly laymen, having nothing in them of all the powers of a spiritual sacrament: that what was believed to be Christ's body and blood was simply bread and wine, a mere earthly substance with no virtue of the Holy Spirit secretly shed on it." [This leads us to wonder whether some were unjustly called Simonites].

C. xxxv. is "Concerning those who have been promoted by Simonizers without paying them any money for it," &c.

*Vol. III. p. 41. Gratissimus, c. IX.*

Accipere sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Domini etiam malus potest (1 Cor. xi.) nam de talibus dictum est, &c. Habere nomen Christi et malus potest: i. e. Christianus vocari et malus potest. Polluebant nomen Dei sui. Ergo habere sacramenta omnia et malus potest.

*Vol. III. p. 55, c. XXIX.*

Dicunt enim quod quæ tunc videbatur ecclesia, domus erat simplex; quod credebatur altare, purus lapis erat; sacerdotes et qui reliquis cernebantur ordinibus constituti prorsus laici erant, cunctisque spiritualis sacramenti viribus alieni: quod corpus et sanguis Domini credebatur simpliciter panis erat et vinum, terrena substantia nullâ sancti Spiritus virtute suffusa.

*c. XXXV.*

De his qui gratis a Simonario sunt promoti, &c.

(B.) LANFRANC, ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

B. 1005. D. 1089.

He was the son of a councillor of state of Pavia. He settled at Avranches and taught there. Travelling towards Rouen to establish himself there, he was seized by robbers who stripped him and tied him to a tree and left him. In the morning he was

found in this deplorable condition by travellers, who set him free. He did not fulfil his first intention, but retired to the convent of Bec, probably because it was near to flee unto. He was received, and in due time rose to be its abbot. His great excellence was a vivid persuasion that the exceeding need of the time was a higher education of the whole body of the clergy. So as soon as he had the control of the abbey of Bec he led the way to this most desirable object, by converting that abbey into the most renowned theological school in France. And we may imagine that it was from a distinct perception of his success there that about seven years later the wise conqueror of England, the irresistible King William, drew him over the narrow channel to become the first Roman primate of the church of England in 1070.

The passages here cited indicate that he had studied the Scriptures for himself. He had lectured at Bec on the Psalms and the Epistles of St Paul to a delighted assemblage from many countries; and though his mind had not those mighty perceptions which force a man to break through the traditions of ages in his way to truth, we can well believe his appointment to the primal see a great blessing to England. We judge of him rather by his Pauline commentaries than by his contention with Berengarius. He prized Cassian's Collations and wrote notes upon them, and he compiled a body of rules to be observed by monks of the Benedictine order. It is high honour to have moderated the Conqueror and to have been the teacher of Anselm.

Among his pupils Pope Alexander II. also is to be numbered. Viewing Lanfranc as the antagonist of Berengar, or Berenger which is his name in French, it is with wonder that we read an early story. The latter sent a letter to Lanfranc to ask him to cooperate with him to promote the views of John Scotus against his contemporary Paschasius Radbert of Corbey. Unhappily Lanfranc was out of the house, and the letter fell into the hands of some of the monks, who were perhaps jealous, and certainly suspicious of Lanfranc's orthodoxy. They reported that Lanfranc had intimate relations with Berengar. So with Berengar he was summoned to Rome to answer for himself. Lanfranc was acquitted in the councils both of Rome and of Vercelli. But perhaps this incident had some effect in placing him in the position of antagonist towards that nascent reformer. In 1063 he was made abbot of a new convent at Caen. During the seven years of his residing there

he wrote his treatise against Berengar: who had indeed recanted at Rome to escape death in 1059, but never ceased, after being restored to France, to propagate his real views. Happily for readers in this century, Berengar's long nearly lost reply has been republished. In 1066 Lanfranc was called to England. His letters that survive are invaluable to his biographers and to historians.

*Letter 33.* "We believe that it is expedient for all at all ages (as well the living as the dead) to fortify themselves by receiving the Lord's body and blood. Nor yet, if it happens that, directly any have been baptized, they go from the chapel before they have received Christ's body and blood, do we in any degree believe that for that they perish ... Otherwise the Truth would not be true Who says, 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.' For that sentence which the Lord says in the Gospel, John vi. 'Except ye eat the flesh,' &c., as far as mere eating with the mouth is concerned, cannot be said generally respecting all. [Note how very far the doctrine received at the school of Bec was now in advance towards the Protestant interpretation of this misinterpreted chapter!] For the majority of the holy martyrs migrated from the body even before baptism under the pains of various tortures. Yet the church reckons them in the number of the martyrs, and believes them to be saved on account of that testimony of the Lord which is said, 'Whoever shall confess Me,' &c. It is necessary therefore that the aforesaid sentence of the Lord be so understood; inasmuch as every believer of capable intelligence

*P. 316, Letter XXXIII.*

*To Domnald, Bishop of Ireland. Works, Paris, 1648.*

Credimus omnes omnibus ætatibus plurimum expedire (tum viventes quam mortuos) Dominici corporis et sanguinis perceptione sese munire. Nec tamen si, priusquam corpus Christi et sanguinem sumant, contingit baptizatos statim de sacello ire, ullatenus credimus eos propter hoc in æternum perire. (He contends against the prevalent belief that partaking of the Lord's supper is in every case indispensable for salvation, as many interpreted much of John vi.) Alioquin Veritas non esset verax qui dicit, He that believeth and is baptized, &c.... Nam sententia illa, quam Dominus in evangelio dicit, i.e. John vi. Except ye eat, &c. *quantum ad comestionem oris* non potest generaliter dicta esse de omnibus. Plerique enim sanctorum martyrum ante baptismum quoque diversis excruciatæ pœnis de corpore migraverunt. Eos tamen in numero martyrum computat, et salvos credit ecclesia per illud testimonium Domini, quod dicitur, Whoever shall confess Me, &c.... Necesse est ergo prædictam Domini sententiam sic intelligi quatenus fidelis quisque, Divini mysterii per intelligentiam capax,

eats and drinks Christ's flesh and blood, not only with his body's mouth but also with the love and sweetness of his heart, that is to say, by loving Him, and in a pure conscience counting it sweet, that Christ for our salvation took (assumpsit) flesh, hung on the cross, rose, ascended, and also by imitating (following) His footsteps and communicating with the sufferings of Christ Himself, as far as human infirmity allows and Divine grace thinks fit to bestow on us. [Clearly Bec was a fountain of spiritual piety as well as of mere learning.] For this is truly and healthfully to eat Christ's flesh and drink His blood, &c., &c. [How was it that Lanfranc and Berengarius did not coalesce, as they so far held the same new truths? We have now to read the recantation by which the latter saved his life at Rome.]

P. 233. "I, Berengarius, believe with the heart and confess with the mouth, that the bread and wine which are placed on the altar are converted by the mystery of sacred prayer and the words of our Redeemer into the true and own vivifying flesh and blood of Jesus Christ our Lord, which was shed from His side, not however through the sign and virtue of the sacrament, but in His proper nature and in the truth of His substance, as is contained in this brief; and as I have read it and you have understood it. Thus do I believe, nor will I teach against this faith any further. So may God assist me and His holy Gospels. Signed, Berengar."

---

carnem Christi et sanguinem non solum ore corporis sed etiam amore et suavitate cordis comedat et bibat, videlicet amando et in conscientia purâ dulce habendo, quod pro salute nostrâ Christus carnem assumpsit pependit resurrexit ascendit, et imitando vestigia Ejus et communicando passionibus Ipsius, in quantum humana infirmitas patitur et Divina ei gratia largiri dignatur. Hoc est enim *vere* et salubriter carnem Christi comedere et sanguinem Ejus bibere. Quotes Aug. on John iii. 10, et in Evang. Johan. Tract. XXVI. [A most true explanation according to the Reformation as far as it goes.]

*The Confession of Berengarius, quoted by Lanfranc in his answer to Berengarius de Corp. et Sang. Christi.*

P. 233.

"Ego, Berengarius, corde credo et ore confiteor, panem et vinum "quæ ponuntur in altari per mysterium sacræ orationis et verba nostri "Redemptoris substantialiter converti in veram et propriam vivificatricem carnem et sanguinem Jesu Christi Domini nostri, qui de "latere Ejus effusus est, non tamen per signum et virtutem sacramenti, "sed in proprietate naturæ et veritate substantiæ sicut in hoc brevi "continetur et ego legi et vos intellexistis. Sic credo, nec contra hanc "fidem ulterius docebo. Sic me Deus adjuvet et sacra Ejus evangelia." Lanfranc adds manu propriâ subscripsisti...Gregorii septimi tempore.

His recantation before the council at Rome denied "that the bread and wine after consecration are only a sacrament and not true (body), and that (Christ's body) cannot sensibly in an (outward) sacrament only be handled or broken by the priest's hands; or ground by the teeth of the faithful, &c. But I pronounce that those who come (teaching) against this faith are with their doctrines and their followers worthy of an eternal anathema, &c...."

P. 240. Lanfranc: "The sacrament of Christ's body (as far as it refers to Christ Himself having been sacrificed on the cross) is His flesh, which, covered under the form of bread, we in the sacrament receive, and His blood, which under the form and taste of wine we drink. By the flesh and the blood, both of them invisible but intelligible and spiritual, *is signified* the Redeemer's body visible, palpable, manifestly full of all virtues, and in Divine majesty. The one of these is indeed broken and divided for the salvation of the people; but the other that was shed from His side is received by the mouths of the faithful. His death on the cross and His blood that trickled from His side are figured (in this sacrament). Although His flesh is truly eaten in the earth and His blood truly drunk, yet He Himself in the time of the restitution [qy. now] continues undiminished and alive at God's right hand... If you ask about the mode in which this can take place, I for the present answer briefly, that the mystery of the faith can be believed to the soul's health. It cannot be usefully investi-

---

The recantation previously signed before the Roman Council denied "panem et vinum post consecrationem esse solummodo sacramentum "et non verum, nec posse sensualiter in solo sacramento manibus sacerdotum tractari vel frangi, aut fidelium dentibus atteri, &c. Eos vero, qui contra hanc fidem venerint cum dogmatibus et sectatoribus "eterno anathemate dignos esse pronuntio," &c. &c.

*P. 240, De Corp. et Sang. Dom. c. XIV.*

Sacramentum corporis Christi (quantum ad id spectat quod in cruce immolatus est Ipse Dominus Christus) caro Ejus est, quam formâ panis opertam in sacramento accipimus, et sanguis Ejus, quem sub vini specie et sapore potamus... Carne et sanguine, utroque invisibili, intelligibili, spirituali significatur Redemptoris corpus visibile, palpabile, manifeste plenum omnium virtutum et Divinâ maiestate. Quorum alterum quidem frangitur et in populi salutem dividitur; alterum vero effusum de calice ab ore fidelium sumitur. Mors Ejus in cruce, et sanguis Ejus de latere emanatus figuratur. [He does not seem to mean are "signified" being absent, but are signified present but unseen.] Chap. X. Cum vere in terris carnes Ejus sint comestæ, et vere sanguis Ejus sit bibitus, Ipse tamen in tempore restitutionis ad dexteram Patris integer perseverat et vivus... Si quæris modum quo id fieri potest, breviter ad præsens respondeo, mysterium fidei credi salubriter potest, *vestigari utiliter non potest.* C. XVII. Ineptus

gated ... You are foolish if you say that the widow of Sarepta could not eat the oil, with which her jar was filled, on the ground that her jar of oil was not diminished ... That is to say, that our Lord Jesus Christ's flesh and blood are eaten and drunk both with the body's mouth and with the mouth of the heart, i.e. corporally and spiritually; since we eat and drink with the bodily mouth as often as we receive the Lord's body from the Lord's altar by the priest's hand: but with the mouth of the heart it is spiritually eaten and drunk, when secretly and usefully, as saith the blessed Augustine, it is laid up in the memory that the only-begotten Son of God took for the world's salvation, &c. And this eating is then useful to Christ's poor, if, sitting at so great a table of so great and rich (a lord) they so eat as to be filled and so remember as to imitate, ready always to die for Christ, continually mortifying their members which are on the earth and crucifying their own flesh with its vices and evil desires."

The tenor is still a spiritual participation not instead of, but *in conjunction with*, a most bonâ fide reception of Christ's natural body and blood. Such is Lanfranc—midway towards the Reformation, but a staunch maintainer of the old doctrine of a real material change. So that on the one hand he held with Berengarius, and on the other would daily persecute him to death.

P. 65. "Wherefore, dearly beloved,' &c., i.e. because the sacraments alone could not save them. 'One bread.' He is explaining the mode and the cause in which and by which the cup of

---

sis, si propterea dicas Sareptanam viduam non posse comedere oleum, quo plenus erat lechitus suus; quia lechitus olei non est imminutus... Carnem scilicet et sanguinem Divi nostri Jesu Christi et ore corporis et ore cordis, hoc est corporaliter et spiritualiter, manducari et bibi: corporali siquidem ore corporaliter manducamus et bibimus, quotiens de altari Dominico Dominicum corpus per manum sacerdotis accipimus: spirituali vero ore cordis spiritualiter comeditur et hauritur, quando suaviter et utiliter, ut dicit beatus Augustinus, in memoriâ reconditur quod unigenitus Dei Filius pro salute mundi carnem accepit, &c. Quæ comestio tunc est utilis pauperibus Christi, si ad tantâ divitis tam magnam mensam sedentes sic edunt ut saturentur, sic recolunt ut imitentur, parati semper mori pro Christo, mortificantes jugiter membra sua quæ sunt super terrâ, et crucifigentes carnem suam cum vitiis et concupiscentiis.

P. 65. *Comm. to 1 Cor. X. 14.*

"Propter quod, carissimi," i.e. quia sola sacramenta illos salvare non poterant. "Unus panis." Exponit modum et causam, quo et quâ



blessing and the bread that is broken become to the recipient Christ's flesh and blood. For by unity in bread and unity in body love must be understood; but if it is wanting they who receive receive judgment to themselves. 'Until He come,' come to judgment. He therefore says this because there will be no change in the sacrifice up to the end of the age, as the Jews' sacraments were changed."

P. 214. "Heb. v. 6, 'After the order of Melchizedek.' After the rite of offering bread and wine, which we read that Melchizedek was the first to do: which however are changed into the flesh and blood of Christ. Heb. xiii. 10, 'We have an altar.' A reason why we should not indulge in an immoderate affluence of food. For in sobriety must we eat the body of Christ, which in other places of Scripture too is called an altar, viz. for the reason that in Christ Himself, i.e. in faith in Christ Himself, as on a kind of altar, our prayers and works are offered and become acceptable to God. Eph. v. 20, 'Because we are members of His body,' &c., &c., having the same flesh and bones which Christ Himself had."

calix benedictionis et panis qui frangitur fiunt accipienti caro et sanguis Christi. Per unitatem enim panis et unitatem corporis charitatem oportet intelligi: quæ si desit iudicium sibi sumunt qui sumunt, &c. "Donec veniat," ad iudicium veniat. Ideo dicit quia hoc sacrificium non mutabitur usque in finem sæculi sicut sacramenta Judæorum mutata sunt.

P. 214. *In Heb. V. 6.*

*"Juxta ordinem Melchizedech."*

Juxta ritum offerendi panem et vinum, quod Melchizedech primus fecisse legitur; quæ tamen in Christi carnem et sanguinem convertuntur. xiii. 10, "Habemus altare." Causa cur escis non sit immoderate affluendum. Cum sobrietate enim edendum est corpus Christi, quod et in aliis Scripturarum locis altare vocatur [Never. See Part I.], pro eo videlicet quod in Ipso, i. e. in fide Ipsius, quasi in quodam altari oblatæ preces et operationes nostræ acceptabiles fiunt Deo. [It is to be observed that Lanfranc writes "quod," which body of Christ, not "qui," Who, i. e. Christ, but when we come to "ipso," and "ipsius," He seems to mean Christ, but even He is never called in the Bible "an altar," if not here, and that it is not here see argument, Part I.] In Ephes. v. 20, "Quia membra corporis Ejus"...eandem carnem et eadem ossa habentia quæ Ipse habuit.

(C.) BERENGARIUS OF TOURS, ARCHDEACON OF ANGERS.

B. 998. D. 1088.

*Teacher and Treasurer of the Abbey of St Martin at Tours.*

The first and last extracts are concerning the lost treatise of John Scotus Erigena on the Lord's supper. I insert them as a kind of cenotaphic inscription regarding that much to be regretted work. Had it survived, it would have taught us the current opinions of the anti-idolatrous party in the church in relation to this sacrament in the time of Charlemagne and Charles the Bald. We can only judge this now from the remains of Berengar, who implies that he did not hear the treatise of John Scotus read in the council of Vercelli, though he in one letter says that he had seen part of his writings. This statement adds something to the value of what is left of Berengarius. John Scotus died A.D. 875. Berengar was a disciple of Fulbert. He and Lanfranc were friendly rivals in stirring up the love of truth in the young men of France. Berengar held school at Tours, and Lanfranc at Bec. Of the superiority of the former both in mental power and in the attainment of truth there can be little doubt. In fact the former was so much before his age as first to be admired and befriended by many, and then persecuted by almost all, including King Henry I. of France, who was also abbot of St Martin's convent. That Berengar like our own Cranmer consented to recant in order to save life ought to humble us as well as him; for it shews human nature's weakness, and indicates the perplexing nature of the casuistry, which for a time entangled not them only but our own very eminent Bilney and our yet more eminent Hugh Latimer. The issues in each of these four cases were different. Bilney, having twice recanted, found no peace, and set out of his own accord to meet persecution, wishing his friends in Cambridge farewell in the touching words that he was going "up to Jerusalem." Latimer refused at last to attend to the hint given that escape was open to him. He said, like Frith a little earlier, that the times required an unflinching self-sacrifice. Cranmer endured the mortification of finding that even the humiliation of his recantation would not save his life: but Berengar was suffered to escape to his own country, and there in freedom openly to confess his unfaithfulness, and again to dare the utmost risk of professing

his real convictions. Why he was suffered to do this is a mystery. In this day of increased liberty it is easy work to blame or praise the various courses adopted and the steps taken by one and another of these tried and tempted men, who at times would be wrought upon by fear, at times bewildered into utter confusion and doubts of all kinds, and at other times would be endowed with a special amount of grace to stand forth unflinching martyrs and confessors for what they then saw clearly. The difference of position between those who, like Teucer from under the shield of Ajax, sent forth the treatises from under the broad ægis of mighty kings, such as Alcuin the favoured of Charlemagne, and John Scotus and Ratram, specially called by Charles the Bald to investigate and test the audacities of Paschasius; the difference I say between the position of such fortunate divines and Berengarius—writing with almost no one to support, encourage, or guide him, and with the age all against him and urged on to persecute and bring him down by the almost unvarying tradition of above 600 years—cannot fail to be noticed. To me Berengar appears a much better and more consistent reasoner than Ratram. Possibly the testimony of John Scotus might have rivalled or surpassed him. We know but little on this. Hincmar declares in his work on Predestination, c. 31, Vol. I. p. 296, that Scotus held that the Lord's supper was "only a memorial of the true body and blood." Perhaps then he was one of those who maintain that it is both a type of feeding on Christ, and also a rite in which we may eminently do so. Perhaps he stoutly denied that the sacrament is a means in the sense that it *conveys Christ's real body* to the receiver, either corporally to the body of man, or mentally to his soul. For this very many have been said to make the supper "a mere "or bare memorial," *ψαλόν τι*. It is not unlikely that Hincmar meant to charge Scotus with something like this. But let me give a citation from Berengar, shewing how he as well as Scotus loved to refer all to the scriptures as the ultimate and only infallible rule. It is from p. 157; he gives it as what he thinks to be the meaning of St Ambrose as well as his own, "*si pugnacitas auferatur,*" *i.e.* if controversial fierceness is to be forbidden to blind our eyes against truth. These are his words: "There are seen on "the altar by the bodily eye after consecration the sensible "substances of bread and wine, but there are not seen Christ's "body and blood, which are laid up in heaven, because, if you lay

"down that, before the restitution of all things, I say not merely "that the flesh of Christ is seen by the bodily eye, but even *that* "it is in the world at all (in terris alicubi), you do this in the "teeth of David's prophecy, Peter the Apostle, his fellow-apostle "Paul and all authentic scriptures." See also p. 198, a very powerful and fuller statement of the same argument. I now need only add that this treatise was not reprinted till 1834, and I am told in a very limited number. But one must refer to Coleridge's inspired burst concerning this Berengarius.

"One seeing eye, lynx amid moles," is Coleridge's bold estimate of this grand wrestler against error. But near the close Coleridge's conceptions find fuller utterance.

"Ye who, secure mid trophies not your own,  
 "Judge him, who won them when he stood *alone*,  
 "And proudly talk of recreant Berengar;  
 "O first the age, and then the man compare!  
 "The age how dark! Congenial minds how rare!  
 "No host of friends with kindred zeal did burn;  
 "No throbbing hearts awaited his return.  
 "Prostrate alike when prince and peasant fell,  
 "He only, disenchanted from the spell,  
 "Like the weak worm that gems the starless night,  
 "Moved in the scanty circlet of his light.  
 "And was it strange if he withdrew the ray  
 "That did but guide the night-birds to their prey?"

*Note.* Respecting the loss of the Treatise of John Scotus, Dr Floss, the editor of the Migne edition, p. x., says that from the different coloured inks and manners of writing, he thinks that the copier stopped in the midst of the Commentary on the sixth of John, lest he should be suspected of holding Scot's opinions, and cut away whole parchments elsewhere that seemed to him to contain similar heterodox matter.

Lanfranc has quoted some portion of his first re-utterance of his opinions: but his reply to Lanfranc was lost till it was discovered by Lessing at Wolfenbüttel and printed in 1777. What I have is the small reprint, Berlin 1834, by A. F. and F. Vischer.

Others besides Lanfranc wrote long treatises against Berengar. Rohrbacher, VII. 459, instances Durand of Troarn as well as Guitmund, one of Lanfranc's disciples, whom I only quote because in the citations he seems to anticipate John of Paris. The Dict. Universel quotes from Guitmund's treatise on the body and blood

of Christ at the beginning, "All the disciples of Berengar indeed "agree in this, that the bread and wine are not essentially "changed... They differ much that some say that nothing at all "of Christ's body and blood is in those sacraments, but that these "(sacraments) are only shadows and figures. But others say that "the Lord's body and blood are truly but in a latent manner "contained (in them) and in a certain way (quodammodo) im-  
"panated, so that they can be received."

John of Paris is very likely to have read this and made his own system out of it. Baronius says that Berengarius revived the opinions of Leuthericus, archbishop of Sens. Mosheim almost alone notices him, saying in two sentences that he believed that only real believers received Christ's body, and that he was repressed by the king. The other Berengarius was a Frenchman, but he was of Poitiers, and of a later date, for he was a follower of the acute Abailard, whose name has been reduced to Abelard.

*On the Lord's supper. Reply to Lanfranc.*

P. 43. "You write that the book of John Scotus Erigena (on the Lord's supper) was read in the hearing of all, who had assembled from various parts of the world, and that it was condemned [*i.e.* in the synod at Vercelli]. To this I have already sufficiently replied that you have yourself related to some 'that that book was condemned for saying that the sacraments of the altar are a similitude, 'a figure, and a pledge of the Lord's body and blood;' a saying for which according to the scriptures it ought to have been most largely approved. I had heard from those who were present at that council of vanity, that no more diligence was used in that book's condemnation than just to hear a certain passage of it once, and that it was in this way condemned when the Lord says, Try the writings, &c.; Peter, a deacon of the Roman church bearing

*De Sacra Cœnâ adv. Lanfrancum, Lib. post. Berlin, 1834.*

P. 43.

Johannis Scoti librum lectum scribis in audientiâ omnium, qui de te diversis mundi partibus convenerant atque damnatum. Ad hoc satis jam rescripsi, te ipsum narrasse quibusdam "librum illum pro eo damnatum, quod diceret, Sacramenta altaris similitudinem, figuram, pignusque esse corporis et sanguinis Domini;" in quo maxime secundum Scripturas debuit approbari. Audieram etiam ab illis qui interfuerunt concilio vanitatis nullâ librum illum aliâ diligentîâ damnatum quam ut semel locus quidam illius audiretur, et ita damnaretur, cum dicat Dominus "Scrutamini Scripturas," &c.; attestante ineptiæ tuæ Petro

witness to thy folly, and hastily throwing down his opinion saying, 'If we are still in a figure, when shall we get a hold of the 'reality?' [Augustine's sayings on the other side adduced.]

P. 28. "You say 'You would be constructing a proof of your own 'perjury.' I only say this. To swear things that should not have been sworn is to go back from God: to desist (to cease to hold) from things sworn contrary to right is to return to God. Nor would Peter have remained an apostle of Christ, after swearing that he did not know Christ, if he had chosen to persevere in the things that he had sworn against the right.

P. 45. "You yourself assert in a later part of the same treatise, that a sacrament is not the colour or form of any little 'portion of 'the flesh, which after consecration is on the altar, but that the 'portion itself is a sacrament of Christ's whole body which is in 'Heaven,' and that the portion itself is broken by men's hands and ground by their teeth ...

P. 76. "Further the comparison, which you have used concerning our Lord Jesus Christ and the stone of the corner, entangles or impedes you and sets us free. For as he that says Christ is a stone of the corner does not in truth make Christ a stone, but sets such a name upon Him on account of some likeness they mu-

Romanæ ecclesiæ diacono, et præcipitante sententiam, ut diceret, "Si "adhuc in figurâ sumus, quando rem tenebimus?" [contrary to many sayings of Augustine.]

P. 28.

"Perjurum te," inquis, "astrueres." Hoc tantum dico...Jurare... non juranda, a Deo recedere est: desistere a juratis contra jus, ad Deum redire. Nec Petrus, postquam juravit se non novisse Christum, Christi apostolus permansisset, si in juratis contra jus persistere voluisset. See also pp. 61, 62.

P. 45.

Ipsæ in posterioribus ejusdem tractatûs asseris "non esse sacramentum colorem vel speciem portiunculæ carnis, quæ sit post "consecrationem in altari, sed ipsam portiunculam...esse sacramentum "totius corporis quod in cælo est Christi," eamque ipsam manibus frangi, dentibus atteri. [N.B. I have omitted before the latter "esse" the words "non quod in eâ subjecta sit, sed eam quæ subjectum sit," not deeming it all necessary, as far as I guess its meaning, see also p. 127.]

P. 76.

Porro similitudo, quam de Domino Jesu Christo et lapide angulari posuisti, te impedit nos expedit. Sicut enim qui dicit, Christus est lapis angularis, non reverâ Christum lapidem esse constituit; sed propter aliquam similitudinem, quam ad se invicem gerunt, tale nomen

tually bear to one another, (so) when the page of the Divine word calls Christ's body bread, it does it in a sacred and mystic mode of speaking; either because He is made of bread, and retains some of its qualities; or because He satiates the soul by an incomprehensible feeding, and ministers to it the substance of eternal life; or that it is the body of the Son of God, Who is the bread of angels, and that into Him, as the prince of the apostles says, the angels desire to look; or in some other way which may be comprehended by beings more learned than we are, but not by us..."

P. 83. "Further, it appears that you have been indiscreet in asserting that what I have said—viz. that Christ is the highest corner-stone makes against you, because it is said by the way of similitude—really strengthens your side. For it must be plain to your erudition that it is not any less a use of a metaphorical mode of speech to say, 'The bread which is placed on the altar is 'after consecration the body of Christ and the wine is His blood,' than when it is said Christ is a lion, Christ is a lamb, Christ is a chief corner-stone; and that there is but one way out, and no more, from that tropical kind of speaking; viz. that when anything is predicated (of a subject) that is not (truly) predicable (of it), since (in that case) the tropical mode of speech has been used concerning that of which it is not susceptible, one term of the proposition be taken tropically, and the other in its own (natural and true) sense."

N.B. It seems to be a pretty good proof of considerable freedom of thought being maintained at that day in France, that the writer of this extract was allowed to live there, after having by

---

Ei imponit; cum Divina pagina corpus Domini panem vocat, sacratâ ac mysticâ locutione id agit: seu quoniam ex pane conficitur, ejusque nonnullas retinet qualitates; seu quia animam incomprehensibiliter pascendo satiat, eique æternæ vitæ substantiam subministrat; vel quod corpus sit Filii Dei, Qui est panis angelorum et in Quem, sicut ait princeps apostolorum, desiderant angeli prospicere; seu aliquo alio modo, qui a doctioribus potest, a nobis comprehendere non potest.

P. 83.

Porro quod scribis, "illud, quod dixi Christus est summus angularis "lapis contra me (Qy. te) facere, quia per similitudinem dicitur, partes "tuas munire" indiligenter apparet te posuisse. Constat enim apud eruditionem tuam, non minus tropicâ locutione dici, panis qui ponitur in altari post consecrationem est corpus Christi et vinum sanguis quam dicitur Christus est leo, Christus est agnus, Christus est summus angularis lapis; totique illi tropicæ locutionis generi unum patere, non amplius, exitum; ut ubicunque prædicatur non prædicabile, quia tropica locutio est de non susceptibili, alter propositionis terminus tropice, alter proprie accipiatur.

perjuring himself escaped murder in the den of the Roman "leopard."

P. 86. "Therefore that Humbert of thine in saying 'that the bread which is placed on the altar is after consecration Christ's body—but that what is bread in the proper mode of speaking 'is to be taken in a tropical sense for Christ's body,' laid it down and rightly indeed, because it is according to the authority of the scriptures ...

P. 107. "I have affirmed that in this Humbert is contrary to himself, and I do affirm it ...

P. 91. "Therefore it was a most mad thing to be said, and a perfect contumely against the Christian religion that Christ's body is made of bread or of any other thing, &c.

P. 113. "Both you without these names (belonging to dialectics) cannot well assert what you attempt without inconsistency; and we could abolish what you would say by the sacred testimonies alone...

P. 120. "That Christ's flesh is called 'our daily bread'—[lit. bread for the coming day], i.e. supersubstantial, [misinterpretation, see Prof. Lightfoot's note], man consists of two (substances), soul and body, higher and lower. The higher is refreshed by Christ's body unto eternal life with inner bread, with spiritual bread; the lower is refreshed to temporal life by sensible bread; which however is after consecration the body of Christ, and in Him has

*P. 86.*

Dicens ergo Humbertus ille tuus "panem qui ponitur in altari "post consecrationem esse corpus Christi—panem propriâ locutione "corpus Christi tropice accipiendum esse" constituit, et illud quidem recte, quia ex auctoritate Scripturarum.

*P. 107.*

Contrarium sibi ipsi affirmavi et affirmo Humbertum.

*P. 91.*

Unde insanissimum dictu erat et Christianæ religioni contumeliosissimum "corpus Christi de pane vel de quocunque confici," &c. &c.

*P. 113.*

Et tu sine his nominibus (dialecticæ artis, &c.) quod moliris non impariter posses asserere; et nos, quæ a te dicerentur, sacris solummodo possemus testimoniis abolere.

*P. 120.*

Quod caro Christi panis epiusion dicitur, i.e. supersubstantialis, homo de duabus constat (substantiis), animâ et corpore, superiori et inferiori. Superior reficitur Christi corpore ad animam æternam, pane interiore, pane spirituali; inferior, ad temporalem pane sensuali; qui tamen post consecrationem et corpus Christi, et in Eo valet etiam in vitam æternam fidei. Ita



power for eternal life to the faithful. Thus since man consists of two substances, soul and body, he that likes may call the body a substance and the soul supersubstantial; and the bread, with which the body is refreshed, substantial; and the spiritual bread, i.e. Christ's body, with which the soul is refreshed, supersubstantial...

P. 131. "If therefore you make such an assertion regarding Christ's flesh, not the truth itself alone casts you down, because also Christ's body cannot admit of desecration, &c., but also the authority of St Ambrose, where he says in the epistle to the Hebrews, 'The sacrifice (host) of the church is one and not many.' How one and not many? Because Christ was once offered; but the church's sacrifice is a pattern of the sacrifice of Christ. Therefore this sacrifice of the church is the very same, always the very same. Otherwise in as many places as the sacrifice of the church is offered, there are so many Christs. By no means. But it is one Christ everywhere, both here fully existing and there fully. There is not another sacrifice, but we are always offering Himself. Yea rather, we are working out a remembrance of the sacrifice.

P. 289. "They that affirm that Christ's flesh either in part or in whole new made, by generation of the subject, is sensibly present on the altar (the bread being taken away by corruption of the subjectum) speak against the authority of eternal and immutable truth...

cum constet homo duabus substantiis, animâ et corpore, potest, qui velit, appellare corpus substantiam, animam super substantiam; panem quo reficitur corpus substantialem, panem spiritualem (i.e. Christi corpus) quo reficitur anima, supersubstantialem. [Prof. Lightfoot has blown away this interpretation of *ἐπιούσιον* in the Lord's Prayer: but it shews how easy it is to slip into saying that Christ's body gets into our souls. See H. Smith.]

P. 131.

Si ergo de portiunculâ carnis Christi ita asseris, non solum te ipsa veritas dejicit, qua et indesecrabile est Christi corpus, &c. sed et sancti Ambrosii auctoritas ubi ait in epistolâ ad Hebræos "Una est ecclesiæ hostia, non multæ. Quomodo una et non multæ? Quia semel oblatum est Christus, sacrificium vero ecclesiæ exemplum est sacrificii Christi. Proinde hoc sacrificium ecclesiæ id ipsum semper id ipsum est. Alioquin quum in multis locis offertur sacrificium ecclesiæ, multi Christi sunt. Nequaquam. Sed unus ubique est Christus, et hic plenus existens et illic plenus... Non aliud sacrificium sed Ipsum semper offerimus. Immo magis sacrificii recordationem operamur."

P. 289.

Qui affirmant Christi carnem vel pro parte vel pro toto recens factum per generationem subjecti, adesse sensualiter in altari (ablato pane per corruptionem subjecti) contra auctoritatem loquuntur æternæ et incommutabilis veritatis. [Yet this view of Lanfranc became the adopted tenet of the Franciscans.]

Letter V. "I sought for myself the gospel of St John, and revolving the things in it which belonged to the opinion, ... I saw that the thing appears thus, that I thought then it surpassed all astonishment that men should be able to dissemble their seeing so great light, or that eyes of reason of any sort could be dark in the presence of so great a light. To speak plainly, I could not pretend not to see such great things; but doubtless I ought not ...

Letter to Richard. "John Scotus wrote, he wrote at the admonition and entreaties of Charles (and) his great predecessor. And he, as devoted to the interests of religion as he was very active in doing public business, that the folly of the uninstructed and carnal men of that time might not prevail over so learned a man, imposed on that John the task of collecting from the scriptures the things which would overturn that folly.

P. 373. Letter to Ascelin. "It thus came to pass that I was silent at hearing that damnable and sacrilegious opinion of Wilhelm which he pronounced, that at Easter every man ought to come to the Lord's table. To come to the point, I have now heard Wilhelm boast that I could not deny that John the Scot is a heretic; but you are my witness that it is not true, if you well remember my words, even though you also hold John the Scot a

*Collection of Letters of Berengar.*

*Dr Sudendorf. Letter V. Hamburg, 1850.*

Petivi mihi evangelium S. Johannis, in quo revolvens quæ ad sententiam pertinebant...ita rem apparere pervidi, ut putarem omnem stuporem transcendere quod poterant a luce tantâ dissimulare, vel in luce tantâ caligare qualescunque oculi rationis. Unde non potui tanta dissimulare; nimirum autem non debui.

*No. VII. Berengar to Richard.*

Noviter quam scripsit Johannes Scotus, monitu illum scripsisse precarioque Caroli magni antecessoris sui. Qui, quantum circa res gerendas perstrenuus, tantum circa religionem devotus, ne ineruditum carnaliumque illius temporis prævaleret ineptia erudito viro, Johanni illi imposuit colligere de Scripturis, quæ ineptiam illam evertèrent.

Note. "Caroli magni" must be an error. A word or two wanting, "et" would clear it or at least make it barely imaginable.

*Epistola ad Ascelinum, Lanfranc Vol. I. p. 373, Giles, Oxon. 1844.*

Inde factum est ut etiam tacuerim ad damnabilem et sacrilegam illam Willelmi sententiam, quam pronunciavit, omnem hominem ad mensam Dominicam debere in Paschâ accedere. Ut ergo ad rem veniam audiavi nunc jactitare Willelmum, quod negare nequiverim hæreticum esse Joannem Scotum: quod falsum esse testis mihi es,

heretic, but how inconsiderately, in how impious a way, and in a way how unworthy of your priestly dignity, may God prevent your any longer doubting, He concerning whom an apostle promises to the faithful, 'But if in anything ye have a different opinion, this also God 'will reveal to you.' For your opinion is contrary to the reasons from all nature, contrary to the opinion of Gospels; and of the Apostles, if you hold with Paschasius, in that which he alone invents for himself, that the substance of the bread entirely departs from the sacrament of the Lord's body. But my words about John were these, that I had not looked quite through all this matter, as now also is true. But as to what I had seen in relation to that matter, that I could recite from the writings of those whom I previously mentioned proofs in the letter to Lanfranc that they must be counted heretics if that John were to be counted one. But that if I should see anything in him not filed into shape sufficiently, I would readily blame him. He only brought forward two passages,...for that the words themselves instituted for the consecration of the bread convince you that the matter of the bread does not depart from the sacrament, and that the cure of souls is not the bishop's rod."

P. 374. Ascelin to my master Berengar. "There are witnesses that that opinion of Wilhelm was put forth in another way ... It was said...unless for some crime done by him he were separated from that very healthful feast; but this should only be done by his confessor's order. Otherwise the church's keys are

---

si satis meministi verborum meorum, quamvis hæreticum habeas tu quoque Joannem Scotum, quam inconsiderate, quam impie, quam indigne sacerdotio tuo, non diutius te nescire permittat Ille, de Quo apostolus fidelibus promittit, "Sed et siquid aliter sapitis et hoc vobis Deus "revelabit." Sapis enim contra omnis naturæ rationes contra evangelicam et apostolicam sententiam, si cum Paschasio sapis in eo quod solus sibi confingit, sacramento Dominici corporis decedere panis omnino substantiam. Verba autem mea de Joanne hæc fuerunt, non pervidisse omnia illius, sicut etiam nunc verum est. Quæ autem vidissem ad eam rem pertinentia recitare me posse ex scriptis illorum, quos præfixeram habendos hereticos in epistolâ ad Lanfrancum si Joannes ille hæreticus haberetur [i. e. several of the fathers in respect of some of their sayings]. Cæterum si quid in illo viderem non satis delinatum, facile me improbatum esse... Duo tantum protulit, &c. Convincere ipsa verba in consecrationem panis instituta, non decedere sacramento panis materiam et non esse virgam episcopalem animarum curam, &c.

*Answer of Ascelinus, Lanfranc, I. p. 374, Giles, Oxon. 1844.*

Domino Berengario Ascelinus...Illam sententiam Willelmi...aliter fuisse prolatam testes sunt...dictum fuit...nisi pro aliquo crimine a se perpetrato a tam salubri sequestretur convivio: hoc autem nullo modo fiat, nisi solo præcepto confessoris sui. Alioquin claves ecclesiæ annul-

brought to nothing. But to return to myself, having considered all the affair, I believe that I did not assemble at that congress unworthily. For I brought with me that which I shall retain in my heart's sanctuary as long as I shall live, fixed and undoubted and not to be violently removed by whatever may happen, if only virtue from God assist me—viz. that the bread and wine on the altar, by the Holy Spirit's virtue through the priest's ministration, are made Christ's true body and true blood. But that John the Scot, &c., and I see that he with all efforts and all determination tends only to this one point, to persuade me, that what is consecrated on the altar is neither truly Christ's body nor truly Christ's blood. But he strives to establish this out of the works of the holy fathers which he perverts. And of these it may suffice that the prayer of St Gregory be noted here. 'May Thy sacraments, O Lord, complete in us what they contain, that what now we bear in appearance we may in the truth of things receive.' The aforesaid John, in expressing the meaning of this prayer, says among other things contrary to our faith, 'They are borne in appearance not in truth.' But that this is not catholic... you know well."

---

lantur. Set ut ad me redeam, omni re considerata non indigne me ad prædictum colloquium convenisse credo. Attuli enim mecum quod quamdiu vixero, adjuvante Divinâ virtute, certum indubitabile nullisque eventibus violabile in sacratio cordis retinebo, panem scilicet et vinum in altari, Spiritus sancti virtute per sacerdotis ministerium, verum corpus verumque sanguinem Christi effici... Joannem vero Scotum... quem totum nisu totaque intentione ad hoc solum tendere video, ut mihi persuadeat, hoc videlicet, quod altari consecratur, neque vere corpus, neque vere Christi sanguinem esse; hoc autem astruere nititur ex sanctorum patrum opusculis, quæ prave exponit. Quorum illam sancti Gregorii orationem hic annotari sufficiat "Perficiant in nobis tua Domine sacramenta in nobis quod continent, ut quæ nunc specie gerimus rerum veritate capiamus." Quam exprimendo prædictus Joannes, inter cetera nostræ fidei contraria, "Specie" inquit "geruntur ista non veritate." Quod non catholice dictum... non ignoras, &c. [Is not Ascelinus evidently right in his interpretation of Gregory the Great? No one would now make St Gregory hold Protestant doctrine. But we do not need to strain any man's words. If any men have said wrong they must "abye it" and we can stand to the Bible sense without their aid. This testimony of the real views of Scotus is most important.]

(D.) FULBERT, BISHOP OF CHARTRES. D. 1092.

He founded a school of high repute at Chartres before he became bishop. William of Malmesbury speaks of him in very high terms for holiness and learning. This praise came from him

on occasion of some money being sent from England to some foreign churches. Fulbert had been prominent in rebuilding his church of St Mary after its destruction by a fire. Fulbert lived 22½ years in his episcopal charge, and is reckoned one of the most eminent of his time. He was a pupil of the learned Gerbert, who became Pope under the name of Sylvester II. A short poem of his in praise of a monastic life survives, which he says is alike free from want and from superfluities—*Nil superest vel abest*: and he compares monks to ants, bees, and stars; and says that they below render service to God like the Cherubim in Heaven. Thus were men sung and won into monkery. A secure sufficiency of food and clothing: no light thing as the world then was; and upon this all imaginary air castles might be built up with a fair hope of fulfilment in earth or in Heaven. One only sacrifice had to be made: the strong instinct in favour of a home with wedded love to lighten it. The decision often went hard: but monachism once adopted was even more unchangeable than marriage itself. An Erasmus once hooked could never go free. Let a near relative of an emperor, such as Ignatius in the ninth century at Constantinople, only shave his crown, and his sovereign is for ever secure from his aspiring or even succeeding to his throne. Superior, Abbot, General of an order, or Pope, he might become: but the removal of holy orders was one of the few things beyond all dispensing powers. On the whole monachism was as a cancer that ate away the vital strength of a kingdom, and the compensating benefits were I think few when all were told. But the personal attractions of it at the time of admission into it were great: and the praises of it by such men as Fulbert told powerfully in its favour: and so it was riveted fast on Christendom till the Reformer of Deventer, sharply resenting its injuries, held up its then overgrown evils to the open gaze and deep reprehension of mankind. Then Erasmus broke up the work of many Fulberts, and methinks our gratitude is largely due to him. Such pioneering work was essential to truth's triumphs in other hands and from other pens and voices.

When Fulbert's master became Sylvester II. and had Fulbert to visit him at Rome, he profited afresh by the Pope's learning, and on his return to France presided with much credit over a convent and school at Ferrieres; and it was in consequence of the spread of his intelligent disciples in many countries that the

French king raised him to the bishopric in 1007: and it fell to him to rebuild that cathedral; when a few years after his rise it was destroyed by fire. But this brings him before us as a devoted advocate of the Virgin Mary, to whom it was dedicated. He assigned to her nativity a day in the calendar throughout his diocese, and wrote a panegyric of her. He wrote also against the Jews, but he pronounced strong condemnations of militant bishops, and taught that the only way in which they were allowed to overcome enemies was by meekness and gentleness, as Christ had done: and he refused to give them the names of bishops till they renounced the leading of armies.

P. 94. "For the bishop, who takes the functions (or the part) of Christ, when he is about to send his priests to the people under them, distributes among them the eucharist of the sacred body to be taken forty continuous days, that while by the grace of the Word they are daily refreshed by the Heavenly bread, they may keep in mind that time in which for forty days the Lord appearing to His disciples and eating with them refreshed them unto fulness with the desired sight of Himself. The bishop's reply to this was ... He says, Consider my son that as there are many churches through the whole circle of the earth, and yet there is one universal holy church on account of there being one faith, so also is there one bread on account of the oneness of the body of Christ. For the bread consecrated by a bishop and bread sanctified by a presbyter are transfused into one and the same body of Christ on account of the secret virtue of the one operating power. ... For that body of the Lord raised out of the dead and placed in Heaven does not now die. That sacrament daily dies to (or for)

---

*Letter III. To Einard. Opera, Migne, p. 94.*

Nam et episcopus, qui Christi vices gerit, sacerdotes viros in plebem subjectam missurus, sacri corporis eucharistiam per quadraginta dies sumendam distribuit, ut, dum Verbi gratiâ quotidie cœlestis panis alimoniâ reficiuntur, tempus illud in mentem habeant, quo per quadraginta dies Dominus discipulis apparens et convescens desideratæ visionis satietate refecit. Ad hoc episcopi responsum... Perpende, ait, sicut, fili mi, multæ ecclesiæ sunt per universum orbem terrarum, et tamen una est sancta catholica ecclesia propter unam fidem, sic et unus panis propter unitatem corporis Christi. Nam panis ab episcopo consecratus et panis a presbytero sanctificatus in unum et idem Christi corpus transfunditur propter secretam unius operantis potentiæ virtutem... Nam illud Dominicum corpus ex mortuis suscitatum et in cœlis locatum jam non moritur. Istud sacramentum quotidie nobis moritur,

us, and daily rises again, appears, and is eaten. But neither in this ought the mind of the faithful to fall against the stumbling-stone of doubt, because the man hears that Christ, having once tasted death, will no more die, when he hears that both the flesh of the man who was taken to Heaven, sitting in the glory of the Father, and the bread that has been sanctified here, are named Christ's true body, while one and the same working Spirit transfuses both that body taken from the virgin, and that other consecrated out of a material and virginal creation by an invisible operation into the substance of true flesh, *i. e.* not of any common flesh, but one truly Christ's, of which He Himself says, John vi. 54." [Here is a new point of belief, that there are two bodies, though Damascen says there are not, and that they are transfused, poured together by the Spirit Himself into one.]

P. 203. "So that being made not only heir but also Christ's body, you carry God in your body. [If not true, shocking.] See in all things the workmanship of Heavenly mercy. See the marvellous sacrament of regenerating grace, and attend in these things to the overpowering working of the operating Word, at whose nod the elements of things put together into a structure in this world's form out of nothing with a varying order, (testify) His inexplicable power, and themselves rejoice with the appearance of their own beauty. If therefore you believe that God can do all things, it follows that you believe this also, and do not curiously insist with human disputings on discerning it. If He could create creatures from nothing, much more may He be able to convert these creatures into the dignity of a more excellent nature, and trans-

---

*quotidie nobis resurgit, apparet et comeditur. Sed nec in hoc mens fidelium scandalum dubietatis debet incurrere, quod Christum, semel gustatâ morte, jam non ultra moriturum audit, cum carnem assumpti hominis in Paternâ gloriâ sedentem et hic sanctificatum panem verum Christi corpus audit nominari, dum et illud de virgine assumptum, et istud de materiali et virginali creaturâ consecratum unus idemque Artifex Spiritus invisibili operatione in substantiam veræ carnis transfundit, carnis videlicet non cujuslibet sed vere Christi de quâ Ipse ait John vi. 54.*

P. 203.

Ut non solum hæres sed corpus Christi factus Deum in corpore tuo portares... Vide in omnibus misericordiæ cælestis opificium. Vide regenerantis gratiæ mirabile sacramentum; et adverte in istis imperiosum Verbi operantis opificium, Cujus nutu rerum elementa de nihilo in hanc mundi formam mutabili ordine compaginata, inexplicabilem Ejus potentiam ipsa suæ pulchritudinis specie lætantur. Si ergo Deum omnia posse credas, et hoc consequitur ut credas; nec humanis disputationibus discernere curiosus insistes. Si creaturas de nihilo potuit creare, has ipsas multo magis valeat in excellentioris naturæ dignitatem

fuse them into the substance of His own body ... Therefore *faith* is the greatest good before all things."

The essence of evangelic faith includes this, that its object is the truth which God has declared. To the assumption that the literal sense must be the object of faith we reply that in every case of dispute as to the sense of language mere assertion goes for nothing. The point must be argued out according to the received laws of human language: a chief one of which laws of interpretation is that of analogy between the case in point and similar cases in the same or like writers. This is our way to the truth of God which is the right object of our faith.

The Franciscan doctrine, that in every place where the consecration of the elements is performed a new body of Christ is created, requires some miraculous conjunction of the several bodies so created and the one body of Christ in Heaven, else there would be several bodies. O what a tangled web we weave when, just to avoid a figurative interpretation in this particular case, we insist arbitrarily on the necessity of a literal interpretation of the words "This is My body." Miracle after miracle is required to clear the arbitrary assumption from becoming intolerable.

convertere et in Sui corporis substantiam transfundere... Ideo fides præ omnibus summum bonum est.

(E.) CARDINAL HUMBERT, ARCHBISHOP OF RHEIMS. D. 1062.

Returning from the council at Rheims, Pope Leo IX. took Humbert with him to Rome 1049, and made him archbishop and cardinal, after sending him on a mission to Sicily. In the time of the Lateran council Pope Nicolas assigned to him to write the formula of recantation for Berengarius to sign. In 1062 he came to England to compose the contention between the rival provinces of Canterbury and York. At his urging, the archbishop of York consented to yield obedience to all the just and canonical commands of the primate. He returned to Rome and died there.

Lanfranc, in his letter against Berengarius, asserts that Humbert was not a native of Burgundy, but of the more polished kingdom of Lorraine (Lotharingia). Lanfranc gives to Humbert



no scant measure of praise. Besides the works here cited, Humbert wrote a treatise against some one whom he likens to Jovinian on account of his maintaining that sacraments *can* have a blessing with those that are not in the unity of the church; and Humbert brands his followers as Simoniaci, followers of Simon Magus: and charges the rebel with being led to it by the love of money, which is the point of similarity between him and Simon Magus; whereas he the cardinal is a follower of Simon Peter. These rebels are also compared by him to Judas, the betrayer of our Lord. If the cardinal loved to reason and write in this strain, it is not surprising that Berengarius was not particularly fond of him, nor he of Berengar. Nevertheless he uses Scripture fairly in reasoning against the ritual of the Greek Church: but he ingeniously justifies the imitation of Jewish customs in the Roman communion. He was made by Pope Victor II. chancellor and librarian of the Roman church. He has been called the eyes of that Pope. In 1058 he was sent with others to Constantinople to promote the union of the eastern and western churches, and when the patriarch Michael refused audience to them, as the French say, *il jouait le grand rôle*, for he laid an act of excommunication against the patriarch before all the people, shook the dust from his feet, and no doubt in the fullest sincerity of conviction, called on God to see and judge between them.

*Against the calumnies of the Greeks.*

P. 932. "Eastern speaker: Throw away the days of unleaven and the observings of the seventh days to the wretched Jews. Roman: To us and to all who think it enough to walk in the newness of the Spirit, all things have been made new, temples, that is to say, and altars, priests and sacrifices, candles, censers, food and drink, and whatever Israel after the flesh used to retain as well in furniture

---

*Adversus Calumnias Græcorum. Opera, Migne, p. 932.*

*On not being deterred by the charge of Judaism from using unleavened bread in the Lord's Supper.*

The Eastern says: *Azymas et custodias Sabbatorum* (i. e. keeping the Saturday before Easter as a fast) *projicite miseris Judæis*; and the Roman replies, p. 961, *Nobis et omnibus in novitate Spiritûs ambulare satagentibus nova facta sunt omnia, templa scilicet, et altaria, sacerdotes, et sacrificia, candelabra, thuribola, cibus et potus, et quæque carnalis Israel tam in suppellectili quam in mandatis retinebat*;

as in commandments; so that the same things are old and not old, after the example also of an eagle to which, while it is naturally renewed, youth comes and old age in one, and its substance does not depart from it. In a like strain we declare that the unleavened bread of Christians widely differs from the unleavened bread of the carnal Jews... We indeed duly venerating the body of the truth out of unleavened bread and in unleavened bread and retaining, &c. For if you receive wine, why do you cast away unleavened bread?...

P. 949. "If you shall examine all the Scriptures thoroughly you will never and in no place find that leaven is put in a good sense, except in one place in the gospel where the Lord says that the kingdom of Heaven is like to leaven, that is to say, signifying apostolic doctrine... lest... your cleverness contented with its own leavened bread... should listen to Amos iv. 5. See also p. 1214. "Before ye offer, it is transpierced with a lance. The portion from the whole of His own (body) which ought to be consecrated is cut off, &c. We blame you that Christ's body is struck through with a lance by you. Christ did not this (at the institution). He by no means appointed that the disciples should do this in His own commemoration. Receive, said He, and eat; not 'Kill' or 'Strike through with a lance.'... It was the soldiers, not the Lord's apostles that killed him. Soldiers not the Lord's apostles pierced His side with a lance. We blame you that ye bury the Lord's body (*i.e.* what remains) in the ground... For the Lord

vetera ut eadem et non vetera sint omnia, instar utique aquilæ, quæ dum naturaliter renovatur, juvenus eidem accedit, et senectus, non substantia ab eâ recedit. Pari tenore prædicamus azymum Christianorum longe distare ab azymo carnalium Judæorum... Nos vero *corpus veritatis* ex azymo et in azymo rite venerantes atque retinentes, &c. Si enim recipitis vinum, cur azymum abjicitis?

P. 949.

Si omnes Scripturas perscrutati fueritis nunquam et nusquam fermentum in bonam significationem poni nisi in uno loco evangelii, ubi regnum cælorum fermento simile Dominus dicit, doctrinam videlicet apostolicam significans...ne...vestra duplicitas suo fermentato contenta...audiat, Amos iv. 5. See also fragment, p. 1214. Antequam offeratis (panem), lanceâ perforatur. A toto Suo (corpore) particula quæ consecrari debet abscinditur, &c., 1217. Arguimus quod lanceâ corpus Christi percutitur. *Hoc autem Christus non fecit.* Hoc in commemorationem Suam discipulos facere nequaquam instituit. "Accipite" dixit "et comedite," non "occidite" vel "lanceâ percutite"... Milites, non apostoli Domini occiderunt. Milites, non apostoli Domini lanceolâ latus Ejus perforaverunt. Arguimus quod in terrâ corpus Domini (*i.e.* quod remanet) sepelitis...Dominus enim corpus Suum comedere

commanded to eat His own body, not to bury it ; and the disciples ate it and did not bury it. We blame you that ye take the Lord's body with warm water."

---

jussit, non sepelire ; et discipuli comederunt, non sepelierunt... Arguimus quod corpus Domini cum aquâ calidâ sumitis, &c. (Qy. perfoderunt.)

(F.) JOHN OF AVRANCHES (ABRINCÆ), FL. 1070,  
AND AFTERWARDS ARCHBISHOP OF ROUEN [ROTOMAGUS].

This prelate, own nephew to Richard, Duke of Normandy, furnishes a good specimen of the ruling and ritual that were in use in those provinces, which were not so happy as to be under the sway of the leaders of public thought, such as Anselm and Berengarius. When however Mauritius the Archbishop of Rouen died, the desire of the clergy was to have Lanfranc himself, then Abbot of Caen (Cadomina), accept the vacant office ; but he refused it, and laboured with all his might to thrust this relative of the Duke into the vacant seat, and he succeeded. Had the monks of St Andrews (Souen) known with how imperious a spirit they would have to deal, they would probably have been able to move the town of Rouen against his appointment. They certainly shewed great power over the town in the extraordinary struggle that arose from his arriving late to perform their own favourite martyr's mass. Their opposition only ceased with his death ; and even now it disgraces the historic page with its venomous and disgusting and profane reprisals ; and inclines one's judgment rather in the prelate's favour. But our concern is with the Archbishop's book on the church offices, as indicating the ritual of the time for the Lord's supper in the N.W. of France.

*Book on Church Offices.*

P. 36. "Thus let the subdeacons leave that spot, and occupy themselves about ministering to the body and blood of Christ, bearing out the paten by the deacon's hand to the priest, that he may break the body of the Lord in it. When this has been done let the

---

*Liber de Officiis Ecclesiasticis. Opera, Migne, CCXLVII. p. 36.*

Ita subdiaconi ab eo loco discedant, et corpori ac sanguini Christi ministrare satagant, efferentes patenam per manum diaconi sacerdoti, ad frangendum in eâ corpus Domini. Hoc expleto sacerdos Dominici

priest with pure and lowly heart complete the consecration of the Lord's body and blood according to the institution of the holy fathers. When then he has come to sing 'Also to us sinners,' let him hardly put forth his voice and smite his breast. For by the raising of his voice he is to express the profession of the Gentiles in the person of the centurion, by the beating of his breast the lamentation of the Jews who smote their breasts. When then he has come to these words *i.e.* 'By whom all these good things alway,' let the deacon then approach, and with his right hand take the right hand end of the corporal, and with the priest uncover it. Let the priest saying, 'By Himself,' touch the cup's four sides with the offered (host). For by the immolation of the body of Christ have the four divisions of the world been redeemed. Also at the end of the prayer let them both raise the cup, and together set it down and cover it. Then let the deacon kiss the altar, and then the priest's right shoulder. The deacon represents Joseph, the priest Nicodemus, the elevation of the host from the altar the taking down of Christ from the cross, the setting down of the host on the altar again the burial of Christ. After this let the priest utter the Lord's prayer with a loud voice. By the loud uttering of the Lord's prayer is shewn forth the unity of our brotherhood according to Cyprian's words... When the clergy makes answer 'But deliver us from evil,' let him finish the consecration office. But when he has said 'Deliver,' let the deacon and subdeacon rise upright and direct their eyes attentively to the consecration of the Lord's body, Luke xxiii. When then he has come to the place,

---

corporis et sanguinis consecrationem juxta sanctorum patrum institutionem puro et humili corde compleat. Dum ergo ad "Nobis quoque" peccatoribus venerit, altius vocem suam proferat et pectus suum percutiat. Vocis enim exaltatione per centurionem Gentilium exprimitur professio; per pectoris tusionem, Judæorum pectora sua percutientium lamentatio. Ubi ergo ad hæc verba venerit, scilicet, "Per quem hæc omnia semper bona," tunc diaconus accedat et dexterâ manu dexterum cornu corporalis accipiat cum sacerdote disco operiat. Sacerdos "Per Ipsum" dicendo, oblatâ quatuor partes calicis tangat. Immolatione enim corporis Christi redempta sunt quatuor climata mundi. Item oratione finitâ uterque calicem levant et simul ponant et cooperiant. Inde altare diaconus osculetur, deinde dexteram sacerdotis scapulam. Per diaconum Joseph exprimitur, per sacerdotem Nicodemus, per elevationem de altari hostiæ depositio Christi de cruce, per depositionem iterum in altari sepultura Christi. Post quæ sacerdos orationem Dominicam altâ voce proferat. Per exaltationem Dominicæ orationis demonstratur nostræ unitas fraternitatis (S. Cyp. de orat. Dom.)... Clero "Sed libera nos a malo" respondente, officium consecrationis perficiat. Sed "libera" dicto, diaconus et subdiaconus se erigant et oculos in Dominici corporis consecrationem intentos intendant, &c. Luke xxiii. 49. Ubi ergo ad locum, "Da propitius pacem," venerit, qui

'Favourably grant peace,' let the official girt with the cloth, who had held (the paten), offer it to the subdeacon, the subdeacon to the deacon, the deacon to the priest, that in it the priest may divide the Lord's body into three parts; one part the priest is to dip into the cup, with a loud voice saying, 'May the Lord's peace,' and immediately add in a low voice, 'May there be a mingling together of Christ's body and blood for us who receive them unto eternal life.' Let a second part be taken in communion by the deacon and subdeacon. Let him reserve the third part, if it be required, in the paten to the end of the mass. By the part of the offered host dipped into the cup is shewn forth Christ's body, which rose from the dead; by that which is eaten by the priest or the people and makes them alive in God, (is represented) Christ's intercourse with His own disciples after He rose from the dead. The holy church calls the third portion that remains on the altar the viaticum (food for the way) of the dying: that she may shew that we ought not to deem them that die in Christ dying but sleeping, inasmuch as they are carried on to eternal life by such and so great a guide. But let not the priest communicate by the dipped bread, but (after the Council of Toledo's decree) with the body apart and the blood apart: the people being made an exception to this, as they are permitted to communicate by the dipped bread, not as enjoined by (the fathers') authority, but from extreme necessity, through fear of any spilling of the blood of Christ. While then the priest is handing the communion to the officials, let him in the primitive way kiss each one; and afterwards anyone that is going to communicate, kiss the priest's hand and receive the communion from

---

*mantili indutus tenuerat subdiacono subdiaconus diacono diaconus sacerdoti offerat, in quâ sacerdos corpus Domini tripliciter dividat; quarum partium unam sacerdos calici immittens, "Pax Domini," altâ voce dicendo, protinus subdat secrete, "Fiat commistio corporis et sanguinis Domini nobis accipientibus in vitam æternam." Aliâ se diaconum et subdiaconum communicet. Tertiam viaticum, si opus fuerit, in patina usque ad finem missæ reservet. Per particulam oblatæ, immissæ in calicem, ostenditur corpus Christi, quod resurrexit e mortuis: per comestam a sacerdote vel populo, vivificantem eos in Deo, Christi cum discipulis Suis post resurrectionem conversatio. Tertiam, quæ remanet in altari vocat sancta ecclesia viaticum morientis; ut ostendatur non eos debere deputari morientes, sed dormientes, qui in Christo moriuntur, dum tali tantoque ductore ad æternam vitam perducuntur. Non autem intincto pane, sed, juxta definitionem Toletani concilii, seorsum corpore seorsum sanguine sacerdos communicet... excepto populo, quem intincto pane, non auctoritate, sed summâ necessitate timoris sanguinis Christi effusionis, permittitur communicare. Dum ergo sacerdos ministris communionem porrigit, unumquemque primitus osculetur, et post, qui communicandus est, manu sacerdotis osculatâ, communionem ab eo accipiat. Postremo vero particulam,*

him. But let the priest at last receive the part which has remained in the cup: and afterwards hand to the deacon, to cleanse and to drink what is then in it; and let him put down cup and paten on the altar's left hand, and at this spot let him receive a part for himself and give a part to the subdeacon. Afterwards when both (cup and paten) have been cleansed, let them partake (of the bread). But let an attendant bring down another cup to the priest to cleanse his hands, &c., &c. But the mass, as aforesaid, is to be celebrated according to the institutes of the holy fathers at the third hour (9 A.M.): for on that very hour Christ was crucified by the tongues of the Jews: and according to common custom at the sixth hour (noon) because in it He suffered by the hands of his persecutors; and at the time of fasting at the ninth hour (3 P.M.) because in it He sent forth His spirit. But any who in case of need, not regularly, but through desiring (an additional) sacrificing, celebrates mass before the third or after the ninth hour, are not to be blamed, since we read that St Leo celebrated mass at dawn.

P. 233. *In explanation of Baptism and the Eucharist.*

"Finally, men must know that Augustine, Ambrose, Gregory, Isidore, Hilary, Maximian, Innocent, and Gelasius firmly believe and define that baptism and the eucharist, and anointing (confirmation) are neither made more nor less effective by the ministration of good or bad priests. But the blessed Jerome, in stirring up (priests) to a holy and pure life, with the same faith though in other words, as some think, in his exposition of the twelve (minor)

---

quæ in calice remansit, sacerdos sumat; et post diacono calicem, ad mundandum et sumendum quod remansit, porrigat; qui in sinistrum cornu altaris calicem cum patenâ deferat, ubi partem sibi accipiat et partem subdiacono tribuat. Post, mundato utroque participant. Acoluthus vero alterum calicem sacerdoti ad mundandos digitos deferat, &c. &c. Missa vero, ut prædictum est, juxta sanctorum instituta patrum horâ tertiâ celebranda est: ipsâ enim horâ crucifixus Christus linguis Judæorum: secundum communem consuetudinem horâ sextâ, quia in eâ passus est manibus persecutorum: tempore jejunii horâ nonâ, quia in eâ emisit spiritum. Qui autem necessitate ante tertiam vel post nonam non perpetuo sed desiderio sacrificandi missam celebrant non sunt reprehendendi (for St Leo celebrated at dawn).

P. 233. *De expositione Baptismatis et Eucharistiæ.*

Sciendum est denique quod Augustinus, Ambrosius, Gregorius, Isidorus, Hilarius, Maximianus, Innocentius, Gelasius, firmiter credunt et diffiniunt quod baptisma et eucharistia et chrisma nec per bonos sacerdotes augentur nec per malos minuuntur. Beatus vero Hieronymus, ad sanctam et mundam vitam provocans, eâdem fide, licet aliis verbis, ut quibusdam videtur, in expositione duodecim prophetarum dicit

prophets, says that it is their life and not their words that make the eucharist: and this is to be accepted with the largest accord of all the fathers, and to be piously explained. For the Almighty God turns the substance of bread and wine into the true substance of the flesh and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, through the faith and the solemn words of the priest, though he be a sinner: but if the priest be chaste and pure and pious, he thus far makes eucharist by this, that by his good life and his prayers he is profitable for salvation both to himself who makes, and to him that receives the eucharist, full though it is of itself without this, &c."

---

quod vita eucharistiam non verba faciunt, quod cum maximâ concordia cæterorum sanctorum patrum accipiendum et pie resolvendum est. Deus enim omnipotens per fidem et solennia verba sacerdotis, licet peccator sit, substantiam panis et vini vertit in veram substantiam carnis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi. Sed si sacerdos castus et mundus et pius est, in hoc facit eucharistiam, ut per vitam bonam et orationes suas prosit in salutem ipsam eucharistiam confidenti et accipienti, quæ per se aliena, &c. &c.

(G.) ANSELM, PRIMATE OF ENGLAND. B. 1034. D. 1109.

He succeeded Lanfranc in the headship of what we may term the theological college at Bec in 1078, and Lanfranc in the see of Canterbury in 1093. He resisted King Henry in the question of investitures, as he had William Rufus as to the rightful Pope. He was a native of Aosta, and while he followed Lanfranc in both his important positions, he surpassed him in philosophical learning, taking rank among the great men of the age as the antagonist of Roscelin the Nominalist, when many were following the lead of the long deceased John Scotus, and on one side or other were bringing their whole intellectual powers to bear on the great questions of religion and the Scriptures. It were easy—nothing in this practical age is easier—than to coin witticisms against the wide and wild spirit of dissension that marked the scholastic age, and to select for popular ridicule an extreme instance or two of the utterly absurd extension of their inquiries: but it would be well to regard such as mere sport in the wantonness of power. For we might deem it worth while to consider whether that system was not a rebellion against the long-standing custom of settling everything by some dictum from the great fathers of Christianity, so as to put further progress out of the question, and shut in all inquiry with a brazen

wall. It was no child's work to rear a fortress of independent thought, and to set the mind of man free from the fetters and yoke of Christian antiquity. And if this was what the schoolmen both attempted and in a great degree attained, no small degree of veneration and gratitude is due to those who like Anselm led the way towards freedom in discussion. It is no small part of the praise due to Anselm, gentle as he was and devout, that he took part as one of the earliest pioneers in this work of emancipating theology without destroying either its humility or its devotion. Possibly Christ's church at the present time requires the same kind of regenerative touch. Even now it may again touch the ground afresh and rise with new force. Something more may be required for the present state of mankind than the double mission work of converting and purifying. The walls of Zion have to be defended against sceptics of every kind, and the latent fitnesses of the Gospel to satisfy all the cravings of the human soul may need to be exhibited. The entire ground of truth is worth occupying. It is all fertile, and man may need all its various produce. Anselm may be honoured for being the true Christian philosopher, as well as loved for being the prayerful wrestler at the throne of grace. Let us not be afraid of saying, *Credo et oro ut intelligam*.

P. 1035. *A prayer to be used before receiving Christ's body and blood.*

"Lord Jesus Christ, son of the living God, Who according to the Father's will, with the cooperation of the Holy Spirit, hast by Thy death given life to the world, I adore and venerate this Thy sacred body and this Thy sacred blood, which has been given, and which has been poured out for many for the remission of sins, I pray for Thy mercy, O compassionate God. By the virtue that is in these things (lit. of these things) make me one of those many, and make me so to feel them through faith and affection, that I may feel them through their effect unto salvation.

---

*Oratio ante perceptionem corp. et sang. Dom. Opera, Migne, I. 1035.*

Domine Jesu Christe, fili Dei vivi, Qui ex voluntate Patris, cooperante Spiritu sancto, per mortem Tuam mundum vivificasti, adoro et veneror hoc sanctum corpus Tuum et hunc sanctum sanguinem Tuum, quod traditum est et qui effusus est pro multis in remissionem peccatorum, deprecor clementiam, misericors Domine. *Per horum virtutem* fac me unum de illis multis, et fac me sic sentire per fidem et affectum ut sentiam ea per salutis effectum. Et absolve et libera



And absolve and set free Thy servants and Thy handmaidens, me and all who have confessed their sins unto me, &c. ...

P. 1055. *A salutation to the Lord Jesus Christ.*

"Body of Christ hail! born of the (or a) holy virgin,  
Living flesh, Godhead entire and true man!

Hail true salvation, the way, the life, the world's redemption,

That thy right hand may set us at liberty in all evils.  
Blood of Christ hail, most holy drink of Heaven,

Wave of safety, washing away our crimes!

Hail blood from the wound in the side of Christ, &c.

Hanging on the cross, &c.

P. 626. Homily, Luke ii. 22. "But that boy, who is now led into the temple, can indicate those who coming to receive faith are introduced into the church. For the holy fathers also so conduct this introduction, that we are observing the customs of the law: because having fulfilled the cleansing in baptism, they introduce them to the sacred altar, to be consecrated with the victim of the Divine eucharist.

P. 372. "Why did God become man? If anyone is putting off the taking of food, because he has not (yet) on that day been present at the celebrating of mass, when that which he

*servos et ancillas Tuas, me et omnes qui mihi confessi sunt sua peccata, &c.*

P. 1055. *Salutatio ad Dominum Jesum Christum.*

Christi corpus, ave, sanctâ de virgine natum,

Viva caro, Deitas integra, verus homo!

Salve, vera salus, via, vita, redemptio mundi,

Liberet in cunctis nos Tua dextra malis.

Christi sanguis, ave, cœli sanctissime potus,

Unda salutaris, crimina nostra lavans.

Sanguis, ave, lateris Christi de vulnere sparsi

In cruce penden (text corrupt).

Four hymns to the Virgin, and salutation. Very strong Mariolatry. Prayer 34 ante perceptionem corp. et sang. Christi, great beauty—little error.

*Hom. Luke II. 22, Vol. I. p. 626.*

Potest autem Puer iste, qui in templum inducitur, illos nunc significare, qui ad fidem venientes in ecclesiam inducuntur. Nam et haec inductionem sic agunt sancti patres, ut consuetudinem legis observemus: quia, expletâ in baptismo purgatione, introducunt eos ad sanctum altare, consecrandos victimâ Divinæ eucharistiæ.

P. 372. *Cur Deus Homo.*

Si quis enim differt cibum sumere, propterea quia nondum eâ die missæ celebrationi adfuit, peracto quod facere volebat, non incongrue

wished to do has been performed, it will be fitting to say to him, Now take food because thou hast now done that on account of which thou wast putting off the taking of it.

*On the unleavened and the leavened bread.*

Anselm, a servant of the church of Canterbury, to Waleran, Bishop of Newenburg.

P. 542. "It appears by many catholic reasons that what the Greeks [the Eastern church] do regarding the true sacrifice, a matter in which their opinions are in (the chief matters) the same as ours, do not contrary to the faith (in that in which they differ from us). For they that sacrifice unleavened and leavened both make the bread a sacrifice : and when we read of the Lord that when He made the bread His own body, He took the bread and blessed it, it is not added that it was unfermented or that it was fermented. It is however certain that it was unfermented bread that He blessed : not, it may be, that what was being done required it, but that the supper at the time of which it was done required it. ... For there is no difference in substance between unfermented and fermented bread, though some think there is, just as there is no difference whatever in the substance of a newly-formed man (like Adam) before he has sinned, and a man in whom the leaven of sin has grown old. Christ therefore seems to have called Himself and His flesh bread, and to have made His own body out of the bread only for the reason that as that bread, be it unleavened or leavened, gives transient life, so His body gives eternal ; and not because of its being leavened or unleavened. And yet in the law, where almost all things were

---

dicitur illi, Jam sume cibum, propterea quia jam fecisti propter quod sumere differebas.

*I. p. 542. De Azymo et Fermentato (Waleranni quæstionibus).*

Anselmus, servus eccl. Cant., Waleranno Newenburgensi episcopo. (1) De sacrificio vero, in quo idem Græci nobiscum non sentiunt, multis rationibus catholicis videtur quia quod agunt non est contra fidem Christianam. Nam et azymum et fermentatum sacrificans panem sacrificat. Et cum legitur de Domino, quando corpus Suum de pane fecit, quia accepit panem et benedixit, non additur azymum vel fermentatum. Certum tamen est quia azymum benedixit : forsitan non quia res, quæ fiebat, hoc exigebat, sed quoniam cæna, in qua hoc factum, hoc exigebat... Non enim differunt azymus et fermentatus substantialiter, ut quidam putant, sicut homo novus ante peccatum et inveteratus fermento peccati nequaquam substantialiter differunt. Propter hoc ergo solum videtur Se et carnem Suam panem vocasse, et de pane corpus Suum fecisse, quia sicut iste panis azymus sive fermentatus dat vitam transitoriam, ita corpus Ejus æternam : non quia fermentatus est aut azymus. Quamvis in lege, ubi fere omnia in figurâ fiebant,

done in figure, it is commanded to eat unleavened bread in the passover, to shew that Christ, for Whom they were looking, was about to be without stain and clean; and that we in like manner who were about to eat His body should be clean from all leaven of worthlessness and wickedness. But now after we have come from the old figure to the new truth, and have eaten the unleavened flesh of Christ, that figure of the old time is not necessary for us in the bread, out of which we make the flesh itself. It is however most fit to use the unleavened, because it makes a better sacrifice than the leavened, both because it is more handy, and is the first form of bread, and is made expressly, and also because the Lord did so. And for this reason I must not omit to say that when the Greeks anathematize the users of unleavened bread, they anathematize Christ. For if they say (that we use the unleavened bread and) because we are Judaizing, let them in the same way say that Christ Judaized, &c.

Waleran to Anselm.

*On the bad effects of differences in the sacraments.*

P. 549. "The friend and spouse and dove of Christ is one: and it is a great obstacle to the unity of the church to have different practices in the sacraments, and that one church should make that lawful which is but its own pleasure in the matter... Why the cup is covered from the beginning with a pall or veil... But we to whom God has revealed it by His Spirit ought not to make the mysteries of sacrificing complicated (entangled) but rather by the example of Jesus to make them clear. Let us not

preceptum sit azymum in paschâ panem manducare, ut ostenderetur quod Christus, Quem expectabant, sincerus et mundus futurus esset, nos qui manducaturi eramus corpus Ejus similiter mundi esse mone-remur ab omni fermento nequitiae et malitiae. Jam vero postquam de veteri figurâ ad novam veritatem venimus, et azymam Christi carnem comedimus, non est nobis necessaria vetus illa figura in pane, de quo carnem ipsam conficimus (Jerome's word). Aptissimum tamen est, quia melius sacrificatur de azymo quam de fermentato, tum quia valde aptius, et prius, et diligentius fit, tum quia Dominus hoc fecit. Unde illud non est tacendum quia, cum Græci anathematizant azymitas, anathematizant Christum. Si enim dicunt quia Judaizamus, dicant similiter Christum Judaizasse, &c. &c.

P. 549. *Walerannus ad Anselmum.*

De sacramentorum diversitate (III). Una Christi amica sponsa et columba, Ecclesiae unitati valde obest in sacramentis discrepare, et quicquid libitum est licitum facere. (IV) Cur calix velo seu pallâ operiatur a principio... Nobis vero quibus Deus revelavit per Spiritum Suum non oportet sacrificandi mysteria implicare sed exemplo Domini

with Moses, as the Jews, put a veil upon them, but with the Lord Jesus strive, in offering, to pass from one degree of clearness to another... "The body of Christ, which was exposed naked on the altar of the cross, was enveloped with clothes in the tomb... Yet we envelope it... as Joseph and Nicodemus did.

*From Anselm's answer to Waleran.*

P. 553. "Some in sacrificing the Lord's body and blood make the sign of the cross over each from the beginning in the canon; others only one over each, where the bread or the body, as by itself named, and the cup or the blood is named singly; but where the one oblation or host is named, they make one cross for both, since as there is one Christ Who offered Himself for us, so there is one oblation and one victim which we offer in the bread and wine. I do not see that those persons differ more from Christ in this, Who once blessed both, than all those differ, who do not sacrifice the cup after supper, as Christ did, and do not sacrifice it *always at even* as Christ did; and who call both together by one name, the oblation or the victim, as Christ did not do. From this we may collect that we can differ from each other without blame in a practice of this kind, if the truth of the thing itself be preserved, when we can without offence be different from the very Author of the sacrifice itself, ch. III. That some veil the cup from the beginning, some with a corporal, others with a

Jesu clarificare. Non cum Mose, ut Judæi, velamen superimponamus, sed cum Domino Jesu offerentes de claritate in claritatem transferri studeamus. Then he comes round by arguing Christi corpus in arâ crucis nudatum, in sepulcro linteis est involutum... Involvimus tamen... cum Joseph et Nicodemo.

*P. 553. Ex Responsione Anselmi ad Walerannum.*

Alii in sacrificando corpore et sanguine Domini singulas cruces singulis ab initio in canone; alii solummodo singulas singulis, ubi singulatim nominatur panis vel corpus et singulatim calix vel sanguis; ubi vero oblatio vel hostia nominatur, unam crucem ambobus faciunt; quoniam sicut unus est Christus Qui Seipsum obtulit pro nobis, ita una est oblatio, et una hostia in pane et vino, quam offerimus. Non video istos magis in hoc discordare a Christo, Qui singulatim utraque benedixit, quam omnes illi discordant, qui calicem post cœnam non sacrificant sicut Christus fecit, velque *semper ad vesperam* sicut Christus fecit; et qui utrumque simul uno nomine vocant oblationem vel hostiam sicut Christus non fecit. Unde possumus colligere quia a nobis invicem in hujusmodi actiones servatâ rei veritate possumus esse dissimiles sine reprehensione, cum ab Ipso Auctore ipsius sacrificii sumus diversi sine offensione, &c. &c. III. Quod vero nonnulli ab initio calicem operiunt, quidam corporali, alii panno complicato, propter

folded cloth, to keep it from uncleanness, and do not let the cup be uncovered, as Christ was crucified without covering, in order that, according to your meaning, He might shew Himself revealed to the world, one will not any more understand that they ought to be blamed on account of Christ's having been bare, and its not being signified by them in sacrificing Him, than because they do not shew Him in the same sacrifice crucified outside the city; not inside a house, and under the open sky.

P. 627. "'I am,' &c. From this text the church's beautiful custom has grown into use, that the faithful in this celebration should bring out with them waxen candles... For a wax candle (lit. a waxen [light]) or candle signifies Christ. For three things are offered in a waxen light; wax, and light, and flame; wax, that the virgin bees made, signifies Christ's flesh, which the virgin Mary bare: but the light in it signifies the soul: but the flame above, the Godhead. Nor can anything be found in the creation more fitly representing Christ. But this practice also increases the grace of the festive occasions, &c. (The 7th Homily.)

*The eleventh meditation—on the redemption.*

P. 767. "Thou wast a bondmaid, and thus wast freed: thou wast thus an exile, and wast brought back; lost, and wast restored; and thou wast dead and wast made alive again. Let thy heart eat this, O! let man ruminate on this, suck (its sweetness) and swallow it, when thy mouth receives the flesh and blood of the same thy Redeemer. In this life make this thy daily bread and food and

custodiam immunditiæ, nec nudum dimittunt calicem, sicut Christus nudus crucifixus est, ut sicut significatio, ostenderet Se mundo revelatum, non magis intelliget eos debere reprehendi propter nuditatem Christi, quæ non significatur ab illis in sacrificando, quam quia non demonstrant in eodem sacrificio Eum esse crucifixum extra civitatem, extra domum et sub nudo cælo, &c.

*P. 627. John XII. 46. "I am come a light," &c.*

Unde pulcher ecclesiæ mos inolevit, ut fideles in hac celebritate cereos, sive candelas, efferant... Cereus enim vel candela Christum significat... In cereo quippe tria offeruntur, cera, lychnus, et flamma: cera, quam apis virgo confecit, significat Christi carnem, quam virgo Maria genuit [N.B. Virgil was mistaken]; interior autem lychnus animam: flamma vero superior Divinitatem. Nec inveniri aliquid in creaturâ potest quo congruentius significaretur Christus (!) Sed et hoc auget festivitatis decus, &c. (Hom. VII.).

*P. 767, Meditatio XI. De redemptione.*

Ancilla eras et sic liberata. Sic es exul, reducta; perdita, restituta; et mortua, resuscitata. Hoc mandat, O homo hoc ruminet, hoc sugat, hoc glutiat cor tuum, cum ejusdem Redemptoris tui carnem ac sanguinem accipit os tuum. Hoc fac in hac vitâ quotidianum panem et

provision for the way, since by this and in no other way but by this both thou wilt remain in Christ and Christ in thee: and in the life to come thy joy will be full.

*Meditation 25.*

(The priest) takes up this so terrific mystery to handle.

*Letter 107. On the Lord's body and blood.*

P. 255. "Mark that the whole of the human nature in soul and in body was corrupt: so it was right that God, Who was coming to liberate both, should be united to both: that man's soul should be redeemed by Christ's soul and his body by Christ's body, in a manner suitable to each. Therefore also we set bread and wine on the altar to represent both, that by bread made body and worthily received by us we may believe that our body will in due time be conformed to Christ's body in immortality and incapacity of suffering, and in like manner may believe that by wine turned into blood and received by us, our souls are becoming conformed to Christ's soul, and in some way at present, while we are, as far as we can, abstaining from sin; and chiefly after the dissolution of the tie between soul and body, when our souls shall be established in the beatitude where Christ's soul now is. And since the soul of Christ had to be represented by some bodily thing, nothing was found in the whole corporeal world, by which the soul could be more approximately represented than the blood, which is the seat

victum et viaticum tuum, quia per hoc, et non nisi per hoc et tu manebis in Christo et Christus in te; et in futurâ vitâ erit plenum gaudium tuum. [Most other matter very excellent.]

But Med. 25. Tam terrificum ministerium suscipit tractandum.

*II. p. 255, Epistola CVII. De Corpore et Sanguine Domini.*

Nota quod tota humana natura in animâ et corpore esset corrupta; oportuit ut Deus Qui veniebat utrumque liberare, utrique uniretur; ut anima hominis per animam Christi et corpus per corpus Christi competenter redimeretur. [This division is without Scriptural foundation, and it will presently break down.] Ideo etiam in altari ad utrumque representandum panem et vinum apponimus, ut per panem corpus factum et digne a nobis acceptum nostrum corpus corpori Christi in immortalitate et impassibilitate conformandum credamus quandoque; et similiter vinum in sanguinem conversum et a nobis acceptum animas nostras animæ Christi credamus conformes fieri, et præsentī quodam modo, dum a peccatis, prout possumus, abstinemus, et maxime in dissolutione animæ et corporis, cum in beatitudine, in quâ ipsa Christi anima est, animæ nostræ constituentur. [What warrant is there for saying that it is given to the blood of Christ specially to cleanse the soul?] Et cum anima Christi per aliquid corporeum representanda esset (Why?) nihil inventum est in omnibus corporalibus rebus, per quod vicinius representaretur quam per sanguinem qui sedes est animæ.

of the soul. [When the Old Testament says the blood is the life it does not affirm that the life resides in the blood; but simply I suppose that blood-shedding takes the life from the body.] For we must not understand that in the receiving of the blood that we support the soul only and not the body also; or in the receiving of the body the body only and not the soul also; but that in the receiving of the blood we receive the whole Christ God and man, and in the receiving of the body in like manner the whole. And although we receive the body separately and the blood separately, yet we do not receive Christ twice, but once only immortal and impassible. But that custom of receiving separately has grown up in the church, because Christ in the supper with His disciples gave it separately in order that men might understand by this that they ought to be conformed to Christ's soul and body. [The question is, (1) does the bread the sign of Christ's body mean that our bodies in particular are specially purged by His body, and if it were so, does it (2) follow that our souls are specially and in particular purged and vivified by His blood? Is it a figure or a doctrine?] But wherefore is Christ's body...broken to pieces by the teeth? According to the fathers' defining we must understand that the bread placed on the altar is changed by those solemn words into Christ's body, and that the substance of bread and wine does not remain, yet we must understand that appearance (species, &c.) remains, that is to say, form, colour, and taste. According to the species remaining some things take place there, which are impossible in relation to essence; that is, breaking to pieces, &c. But therefore that which no longer exists in it appears

---

[Here we see to what marshy ground we pass when we add to the imagery of Scripture. Anselm sees it and feels it.] Non enim intelligendum est quod in sanguinis acceptione solam animam non etiam corpus, vel in acceptione corporis solum corpus non etiam animam suscipiamus; sed in acceptione sanguinis totum Christum Deum et hominem, et in acceptione corporis similiter totum accipiamus [i. e. the distinction had better not have been made; and holy Scripture does not direct or lead us to draw it.] Et quamvis separatim corpus separatim sanguinem, non tamen bis sed semel Christum accipimus immortalem et impassibilem. Sed iste mos separatim accipiendi in ecclesia inolevit, quod Christus in cenâ cum discipulis separatim dedit [so far it is Scriptural, but he adds] ut per hoc intelligerent se animæ et corpori Christi debere conformari. Quare autem corpus Christi...dentibus atteratur, &c. Secundum diffinitiones patrum est intelligendum panem, super altare positum, per illa solennia verba in corpus Christi mutari, nec remanere substantiam panis et vini, speciem tamen intelligendum est remanere, formam scilicet colorem et sorem. Secundum speciem remanentem quædam ibi sunt, quæ nullo modo secundum hoc quod est possunt fieri--scilicet quod atteritur, &c. [But he adds quod uno loco concluditur, as if Christ's body had not

there; and that which does exist is concealed; because, if that which is there appeared, the mind of man would revolt from it. But according to the appearance it can be received equally by the faithful and by the unbeliever."

To this inference later divines of the Roman communion object, and they deny it. Clauses and words are omitted which both seem irreverent and are not essential to the argument.

---

secundum id quod est, limited locality !] Ideo autem quod non est apparet, i. e. the bread and wine, et quod est celatur, i. e. Christ's body and blood; quia, si quod est videretur, animus humanus abhorreret. Secundum vero speciem, potest accipi æqualiter a fidei et ab infidei.

(H.) WALERAN OF NEWENBURG. FL. 1109.

P. 550. "Jesus was naked on the altar of the cross: let him appear bare on the altar of our immolation... That bread is truly the body of Christ, and as the immolation of Christ's body was made on the cross, it must be immolated on the altar... The glorified Jesus leaves behind Him the garments of corruption, which He had in the tomb. He removed corruptible things from Him. Clothed in incorruption He leaves the sepulchre. He manifested His glory to those that love Him. Why, therefore, do we openly declare the infirmity in Christ incorruptible, when He has come out of this covering of Him as it were with a napkin, and the involving of Him in darknesses of this kind, when we publicly declare Him to be most truly the excellency (or power) of God and the light of the world?... As He being Himself priest and victim offered Himself, so let also our sacrifice be offered to Him, placed in the clear light, that it may shine unto life to all that are in the house. Our victim is then in the highest

---

*Walerannus. Migne's Anselm, Vol. I. p. 550.*

He writes to Anselm to ask why there are different rituals, why fermented bread is used, and why the elements are covered with a veil. Nudus Jesus in arâ crucis: nudus appareat in arâ nostræ immolationis. ...Panis ille vere Christi corpus est, et ut Christi corporis [in cruce] immolationem immolari [super altare] oportet... Glorificatus Jesus corruptionis vestimenta [quæ in sepulchro habuit] deserit: corruptibilia a Se removet. Incorruptionem vestitus sepulchrum deserit... Gloriam Suam (omit Se) amantibus patefecit. Cur ergo incorruptibilis ex sudarii involutione quasi Christi protestamur infirmitatem, et in hujusmodi tenebris involutionem, cum Eum verissime protestamur Dei virtutem et mundi lucem?... Sicut Ipsemet sacerdos et hostia, obtulit Semet ipsum, ita et nostrum Ei offeratur sacrificium, positum sub divo, ut omnibus ad vitam in Christi luceat domo. Tunc maxime acceptabilis victima



degree acceptable, if it shall be like the sacrifice of Christ, yet we also cover up our life-giving sacrifice... That which is offered not in appearance alone but in the truth of reality, ought not to differ in its own immolation, &c. Our paschal Victim was immolated on the altar of the cross with a naked body: He wished to be offered with a naked body, Who made known to His own disciples all that He heard from His Father. He manifested Himself in His own immolation, as He is, and we shall contemplate His glory with unveiled face, so that we may be conformed to Him in all things, being of the same form with the body of His own brightness, that He Himself may be all things to us in eternal blessedness. And, to use His own words, He said, 'It has been 'finished,' that we may not doubt that old things have passed away, and that all things are new. The temple's veil has been rent from the top downwards; and it has been to our own day placed on the hearts of the Jews, that having eyes they may not see, and having hearts they may not understand. But it is not right for us, to whom God has given revelation by the Holy Spirit, to complicate mysteries, but by the example of the Lord Jesus to clear them. We with Moses, like the Jews, are putting a veil on them; but offering with our Lord Jesus let us study to transfer ourselves from one degree of brightness (clearness) to another."

---

*nostra est, si Christi hostiæ fuerit consimilis. Involvimus tamen et nos vitalem hostiam... Quod non solum offertur in specie, sed in rei veritate discrepare non oportet in suâ immolatione, &c. (Part II.) Paschalis Hostia nudato corpore in arâ crucis immolata est; nudato corpore offerri voluit, Qui omnia quæ audivit a Patre Suis nota fecit. In Suâ immolatione Semet ipsum, sicuti est, manifestavit, Cujus gloriam revelatâ facie contemplabimur, ut Ei per omnia conformemur, configurati corpori claritatis Suæ, ut Ipse sit nobis omnia in æternâ beatitudine. Et, ut Ipsius verbis utar, "Consummatum est" inquit, ut vetera non ambigamus transiisse et omnia nova esse. Velum templi scissum est a summâ usque deorsum; quod usque in hodiernum diem positum est super corda Judæorum, ut oculos habentes non videant, et, aures, non intelligant. Nobis vero, quibus Deus revelavit per Spiritum sanctum, non oportet sacrificandi mysteria implicare, sed exemplo Domini Jesu clarificare. Nos cum Moyse, ut Judæi, velum superimponimus, sed cum Domino Jesu offerentes de claritate in claritatem transferri studeamus. [In the letter Part II. stands before the rest that is cited.]*

(I.) IVO (YVES) CARNOTENSIS (*i.e.* of Chartres).

B. 1040. D. 1115.

It is pleasant to set down the name of this most conscientious bishop, who not only, like our seven bishops in James II.'s reign,

went cheerfully to prison rather than allow evil, but even influenced Pope Urban II. by his unyielding resistance to the criminal passion of his own king. He seems to have had in other respects the high character of Bishop Ken, as well as to have been like him in holding superstitious views of this most touching and most spiritual of all rites that were ever enjoined by God or by Christ. One would suppose that his queen Bertha must have regarded Ivo's very name with affection and reverence, and that even King Philip and Berthalda, or Bertrade, of Montfort, Countess of Anjou, must have respected his consistent fidelity. Besides the rules of his Decretum, he wrote eight books which he termed Panormia, being his judgments on a great variety of religious and ecclesiastical questions. He is spoken of as learned in the Scripture, and as one of the eloquent preachers of France, by Nicolas de Clemangis in relation to Petrarch's saying that France had produced few eminent speakers. He was of a noble family of Beauvais, and became, first, Prior, and then Abbot of Bec. From this post he was raised to the bishopric of Chartres in 1092. Fulbert had died in 1029. The Romans complain that he was an inconsistent churchman, because he sometimes favoured the Gallican liberties above what were termed the supreme rights of Rome and the Pope over all lands. Yet he was made a saint in the Roman calendar, although Fulbert had been passed over. There is a curious letter from the King of France asking him to send him some ermine furs, and a still more curious refusal from Ivo, on the ground that it neither became a king to ask such vanities at a bishop's hands, nor a bishop to send such presents to a king. He seems worthy of having been placed by Mr Carlyle in his list of heroes.

P. 259. *Decrees*. "That sacred vessels be not handled by others than by sacred men. *Decrees of Pope Sextus VI.* Of sacred women who may have presumed to handle sacred vessels and altar-palls. *Letter of Pope Soter*, chap. 267. We have decreed that incense be placed on the oblation of the body and blood of the Lord.

---

*Decreta, Pars III. Cap. CCLXIV. Vol. I. p. 259.*

Ut sacra vasa non ab aliis quam a sacris viris tractentur. *Ex decretis Sixti Papæ*, Cap. CCLXV. De sacris fœminis, qui sacra vasa et pallas altaris tractare præsumpserint. *Ex epistola Soteris Papæ*, Cap. CCLXVII. Ut...super oblatione corporis et sanguinis Domini incensum

Chap. 268. That as often as the presence of a new [congregation of] people shall have filled one church, so often the sacrifice be offered again.

P. 274. "That the presbyters announce to the people that in Lent and in the fast of the four seasons (*i.e.* the first week in March, the second in June, the third in September, the fourth in December), *i.e.* the fourth and sixth Sunday and Saturday only, they ought to kneel at the solemn rites of the mass. On the other hand, on Lord's days or other feasts they kneel not from evening until evening, but bend themselves standing and pray, nor let any one presume to only pray with one knee impressed on the ground (as the Jews are said to have done in the passion in mockery of the Lord) [probably when compelled to take part in Christian worship], but place both knees on the ground." Ephesians iii.

ponatur decrevimus. Cap. CCLXVIII. Ut quoties basilicam aliquam iterum præsentia novæ plebis impleverit toties *sacrificium* subsequens offeratur.

*Pars IV. Cap. XXXVI. p. 274.*

Ut presbyteri plebibus annuncient quod in Quadragesimâ et in jejuniis quatuor temporum (in Martio heb. prima, in Junio secunda, in Septembri tertia, in Decembri quarta, &c., see 35, *i.e.* quartâ et sextâ feria et Sabbato) tantummodo ad missarum solennia genua flectere debeant. In Dominicis contra diebus vel cæteris festis a vespérâ usque ad vesperam non flectant genua, sed stantes incurvati orent, nec quisquam uno genu solo tenus impresso orare præsumat (sicut Judæi irridentes Dominum in passione Ejus fecisse leguntur) sed utraque genua in terram ponat. Ephes. iii., "I bow my knees," &c.

(J.) DURAND, BISHOP OF LAODICEA. FL. 1070.

*A letter of Durand of Laodicea concerning the flesh and blood of the Lord, against Bruno of Angers and Berengar of Tours.*

P. 319. "To Henry, the most glorious king of the Franks. There is a report, &c., in what way Br., Bishop of A., and also B., introduce ancient heresies to modern times, and build up (the

*Durandi Laodicensis Episcopi Abbatis Troarnensis Epistola de C. et S. D. Contra Brunonem Andegavensem et Berengar. Turon. M.B.V.P. 1646. Vol. IV. p. 319.*

Gloriosissimo, &c. Regi Francorum Henrico. Fama, &c., qualiter B., A. E., item B., antiquas hæreses modernis temporibus introdu-

belief) that the Lord's body is not so much a body as a shadow and figure of the Lord's body, &c., &c. And they say that you with that zeal and that fervour, with which you are always burning towards holy church, by Divine inspiration have summoned a council to conquer them again and to confute them, &c., &c. But we, pressed by the brevity of a letter, will set forth a few things out of many, and first will place before you examples (authorities) with reference to the Lord's body and blood, &c., &c. For this reason we think that Bruno and Berengar were already anathematized. But if it be so, truly the being heard in a council ought to be utterly denied to them; and with your bishops and ours (if it so seems fit to you), with your emperor who is favourable, and with the Pope himself, deliberation must be had what vengeance should be (Lat. and Greek 'may be') determined against them. For it is just that they whose hands are against all men should have the hands of all excited against themselves."

*cendo astruant, corpus Domini non tam corpus esse quam umbram et figuram corporis Domini, &c. &c. Quos ad redomandum et publice confutandum, eo zelo eoque fervore quo erga sanctam ecclesiam Divinâ inspiratione plurimum semper ardetis, aiunt vos concilium advocasse, &c. &c....Sed nos ex multis, epistolari brevitatem cogente, pauca exponemus et primo ponemus exempla pertinentia ad corpus et sanguinem Domini. Then Leo, Cyril, Ambrose, Augustine, Basil, Hilary. Quamobrem Brunonem et Berengarium jam anathematizatos arbitramur. Quod si ita sit, vere illis audientia concilii deneganda est, et cum vestris cumque nostris episcopis (si vobis ita videtur) cum amico vestro imperatore, cum ipso Papâ, quæ vindicta in illos statuatur deliberandum. Est enim justum ut, quorum manus sint contra omnes, omnium manus etiam contra ipsos excitentur.*

(K.) GUITMUND OR GUIMOND, ARCHBISHOP OF AVENA. D. 1105.

Born in Normandy he joined the Benedictine Monastery of St Leufriad of the Cross. When his own excellence had made him many enemies there, he judged it best to retire from the country for the sake of peace, and obtained his abbot's permission to withdraw to Italy. His merit there attracted the attention of Gregory VII., and he was made cardinal, but he received his archbishopric afterwards from Urban II. He is chiefly signalized by having published against Berengar the work from which our extracts are taken about the year 1070, which is written in the form of a debate between himself and another monk. It has been printed

at Louvain with other works against Berengarius and Peter Bruis by Lanfranc, Alger, Peter of Cluny, Adelman and Ivo, in 1561. The preface gives to Lanfranc the praise of superior gravity and acumen, to Guitmund of being most vivid and ardent, to Alger of eloquence and abundance, and to Peter of erudition and fluency: but the last two it does not characterize. Its malison against all who do not hold the actual and real natural presence of the Lord's body in the Lord's supper is very express and copious.

P. 32. "Berengar and his followers maintain that the eucharist of the Lord is not truly and substantially the Lord's body and blood: but is so called in word only because it is significant of the Lord's body and blood as a shadow and figure. Nor should I be so moved concerning this thing, if persons carnally wise in matters of the senses were deceived, except that they seem to put forth some little reasons as you have mentioned above, and to fortify their positions by some of Augustine's opinions. They also boast some words of the Lord the Saviour, at which weak persons may possibly stumble. And first I will set down their small reasons themselves, and next their authorities. Nature, they say, does not endure to be changed; and when a scripture is adduced that the Lord has done all things whatsoever He would, 'But this 'change,' they say, 'He did not will. For far be it that it be 'deemed proper for Christ to be ground by the teeth, or dissipated 'in parts, as those (signs) are ground by the teeth and dissipated 'into parts.'... *Guitmund*... But others that do yield to the church's right reasonings (in other things) and yet do not come back from their folly (in this), say that the Lord's body and blood

P. 32.

Rogerus says, Berengarius et qui eum sequuntur asseverant eucharistiam Domini non esse vere substantialiterque corpus et sanguinem Domini: sed solâ voce sic appellari pro eo quod tanquam umbra et figura significativa sit corporis et sanguinis Domini. Nec de hoc moverer adeo, si carnaliter sapientes secundum sensus fallerentur, nisi quod nonnullas, ut supra memorasti, ratiunculas obtendere, et eas ex quibusdam Augustini sententiis munire videntur. Aliqua etiam verba Domini Salvatoris jactitant, ex quibus infirmi scandalizari forsitan possint. Ac primum ipsas ratiunculas, deinde auctoritates ponam. Natura, inquiunt, hanc mutationem non patitur: cumque eis affertur Scriptura, quia omnia, quæcunque voluit, Dominus fecit, sed hanc, inquiunt, mutationem noluit. Absit enim ut fas sit Christum dentibus atteri, aut partibus dissipari, sicut ista dentibus atteruntur et in partes dissipantur... *Guitmund*... Alii vero rectis ecclesiæ rationibus cedentes nec tamen a stultitiâ recedentes, ut quasi aliquo modo nobiscum esse videantur, dicunt ibi corpus et sanguinem Domini reverâ sed

may be in reality, but in a latent way contained there, as if (we said) that they in some way appear to be with us, and that they may be in a certain way, if I may say so, impanated [received into the bread], that they may be received (by us).

P. 36. "The benediction of this sacrament is capable of distribution, but not of being expended by being distributed. ... For so in individual masses we believe that the whole Christ is (present), so that there are never made more Christs than one, or a divided Christ by there being different priests or different places. And in this those cannot be against us, who believe Christ's body to be invisibly present in every mass. For when a thousand masses are celebrated at once, and, as they themselves agree, the body of Christ is in every mass (for they themselves also deny that the Lord's body can be divided), either there will then be a thousand Christ's bodies, or they will confess with us that at one and the same time one and the same Christ's body can be held to be (present) whole and undivided in a thousand places ... In like manner therefore also in (each) one host, although He seem to be as it were divided into many pieces. For we expect no division in them, because all the pieces joined together are each separated, and make that same whole Christ's body [*i.e.* they are at the same time both joined together and separated!]. Nor ought that to seem incredible to anyone.

P. 37. "As our soul is the life of the body, so let the flesh of Christ be (yea and the better by the grace of God) the life of the church. If therefore Christ can cause (as we said) each separate

---

latenter contineri, et, ut sumi possint, quodam modo (ut ita dixerim), impanari, &c. &c. [Thus John of Paris was but a borrower.]

P. 36.

Benedictio hujus sacramenti scit distribui, nescit distributione consumi... Nam ita in singulis (missis) totum credimus esse Christum, ut nec plures Christos nec divisum Christum faciat aut sacerdotum diversitas aut locorum. In quo quidem illi contra nos esse non possunt qui corpus Domini in omni missâ adesse invisibiliter credunt. Nam cum simul mille celebrantur Missæ, et, sic ipsi consentiunt, in omni missâ est totum corpus Christi [dividi enim posse corpus Domini et ipsi negant], aut mille tunc erunt Christi corpora, aut fatebuntur nobiscum uno eodemque tempore mille in locis unum idemque Christi corpus totum et indivisum posse haberi... Similiter igitur et in unâ hostiâ, etsi videatur quasi in plures partes dividi. Nullam enim in eis divisionem attendimus, quia quod omnes, simul junctæ, id ipsum singulæ separatæ sunt totum Christi corpus. Nec cuiquam incredibile id debet videri, &c.

P. 37.

Sicut anima nostra vita est corporis, ita sit ecclesiæ (immo multo melius per Dei gratiam) vita caro Salvatoris... Si igitur potest Christus efficere (sicut diximus) ut unaquæque separata particula sit totum

particle to be Christ's whole body, and yet all separate particles are not more bodies but one body, just as a voice strikes the ears of a thousand men and is whole with each one, and yet there are not said to be many voices but only one; and as the whole soul fills a thousand particles of the body of man, and though it gives itself whole to each, the soul is not many but one, so now there seems to be no reason because of their breaking into pieces, in the way of the possibility of Christ's willing or of its being right for Him to will the transference of bread and wine, as He has taught and as the church has believed, into His own body and blood."

It is so wonderful that philosophical men like Guitmund failed to discern the unlikeness of air and soul to Christ's body, for they held firmly enough as a principle of logical science, that *inter dissimilia non constat ratio*, or, in English, comparison holds not between things of different kinds—in the things in which their natures are different.

---

*Christi corpus, et tamen omnes separatæ non plura sint corpora sed unum corpus, quemadmodum vox mille hominum percutit aures, et apud unumquemque tota est, nec tamen plures dicuntur sed una sola; et quemadmodum tota anima mille corporis humani replet particulas, et cum se totam præbeat singulis, non plures tamen sed una est anima, ita jam nulla ratio propter hujusmodi quasi partitiones obstare videtur, ut non possit aut velle non debeat Christus, panem et vinum, sicut Ipse docuit et ecclesia credidit, transferre in corpus et sanguinem Suum.*

(L.) ALGERUS OF LIEGE. D. 1131.

P. 129. "Although the substance itself of the bread be by a miracle converted into Christ's body, yet let the form of bread that remains not be thought of as to remain for ever in Christ's body. ...For if Christ is impanated, or converted into bread [two different theories] (which [last] it is unlawful to suppose since it is unchangeable) or (if it) becomes bread, as the Word was made flesh (which is trifling, since the authority of evangelic prophecy builds up no such idea, when on the contrary also it is bread that becomes Christ's flesh; so that bread does not remain), &c."

---

P. 129.

*Quamvis ipsa panis substantia mirifice in corpus Christi conversa sit, panis tamen forma, in sacramento remanens, mansura perpetualiter in Christi corpore non putetur... Nam si impanatur Christus vel in panem convertitur (quod est nefarium cum sit immutabilis), vel fit panis, sicut Verbum caro factum est (quod frivolum est cum non astruat auctoritas evangelica prophetalis, cum e contrario etiam panis fiat caro Christi: ita ut non remaneat panis), &c.*

(M.) THEOPHYLACT, ARCHBISHOP OF BULGARIA, BISHOP 1078.  
*Tutor to Constantine, Son of the Emperor Michael.*

This writer, looked upon as the last of the Greek fathers, had been long misplaced in the scandalous period of Michael and Theodora and Cæsar Barda, who substituted Photius for Ignatius, because he could not bear the rebuke of the John the Baptist of those days for a crime blacker, if possible, than that of Herod Antipas. But the extant letters of Theophylact assign him to the brighter days of Alexius Comnenus and his literary daughter Anna Comnena, whose historical vanity lives under the magic pen of Scott. A Greek prefatory stanza informs us that his commentaries on the Gospels were written by command of the Virgin Mary: but John Hausschein (Æcolampadius) thought them worthy of his hand, as translator. But the commentaries, on fully two-thirds of the New Testament, have attracted the attention of many. The letters which fixed the authentic date of the labours of Theophylact were a reward of the researches of the famous Jesuit Sirmond, shewing that so great a man as Clement VIII.'s librarian of the Vatican, Baronius, could err by 200 years.

Humbert's attack on the Greek Church made two parties in it, one of which was for the use of leavened, the other of unleavened bread in the Lord's supper. Peter of Antioch of the former party maintained that our Lord's observance of the passover took place a day earlier than the fourteenth Nisan, and therefore that He did not use unleavened but leavened bread; and therefore that all Christians ought to use leavened bread as He did, and that Theophylact wrote to overthrow this. For Theophylact denies the anticipation of the time by our Lord in keeping the feast, and therefore asserts that Christ used leavened bread. How then can Peter of Antioch side with his own Eastern church, which used leavened bread in the Lord's supper, and blamed the Western Church for using unleavened? His defence, as ours, is that in such a point we are not bound to follow our Lord's precedent. The point is not one of sufficient importance. And yet it must be allowed that the Greek church made much of it in its long and frequently renewed contention with the West, and in the reverse the Western church with them. The truth seems to be that both



churches rather stood upon their own superior claims; and that concession for unity and love was not acceptable to either. Theophylact wrote on parts of the Old Testament and on other subjects also.

P. 1308. "But observe that the bread eaten by us in the mysteries is not figurative of the Lord's flesh, but on the contrary it is My flesh. For the bread is changed (lit. transmade) by the words of ineffable majesty (lit. ineffable words); bread through the mystic blessing and coming of the Holy Spirit to it (being changed) into the Lord's flesh. And let not the bread being believed to be flesh disturb any: for also when the Lord was walking about in the flesh and desiring the food of bread, that bread that was being eaten by Him was being changed (lit. transferred) and was being assimilated with His holy flesh, and was being changed unto His increment and composition according to the nature of man. Therefore now also the bread is being changed into the Lord's flesh. But how, says one, does it not appear to us flesh but bread? That we might not be indisposed to the food. For if it appeared to be flesh, we should be in an unpleasant state of feeling as to partaking of it. But now, as the Lord condescends to our infirmity, the mystic food appears such to us as is conformable to our habits... For (the flesh) that is being eaten by us is not flesh of a mere man, but of God, and able to make us God as having been mingled with Deity... 'He that eateth this bread,' &c. There we learn the mystery of the participation, for there takes place a mingling together strange and beyond reason, that

---

*Comm. John VI. 48—52. Works, Migne.*  
*Vol. I. p. 1308.*

Πρόσχες δὲ ὅτι ὁ ἄρτος ἐν τοῖς μυστηρίοις ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἐσθιόμενος οὐκ ἀντίτυπὸν ἐστὶ τῆς τοῦ Κυρίου σαρκός, ἀλλ' ἡ σὰρξ Μοῦ ἐστὶ. Μεταποιεῖται γὰρ ἀπορρήτοις λόγοις ὁ ἄρτος διὰ τῆς μυστικῆς εὐλογίας καὶ ἐπιφοιτήσεως τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος εἰς σάρκα τοῦ Κυρίου. Καὶ μὴ τινα θροεῖτω τὸ τὸν ἄρτον σάρκα πιστεύεσθαι· καὶ γὰρ τοὶ καὶ ἐν σαρκὶ περιπατοῦντος τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ τὴν ἐξ ἄρτου τροφὴν προσιεμένον, ὁ ἄρτος ἐκεῖνος ὁ ἐσθιόμενος εἰς σῶμα Αὐτοῦ μετεβάλλετο καὶ συνεξωμοιοῦτο τῇ ἀγίᾳ Αὐτοῦ σαρκί, καὶ εἰς αὐξήσιν καὶ σύστασιν μετεβάλλετο κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρωπινόν. Καὶ νῦν οὖν ὁ ἄρτος μεταβάλλεται εἰς σάρκα τοῦ Κυρίου. Καὶ πῶς, φησιν, εἰ σὰρξ οὐ φαίνεται ἡμῖν ἀλλ' ἄρτος; Διὰ τὸ μὴ ἡμᾶς ἀηδίζεσθαι πρὸς τὴν βρώσιν. Εἰ μὲν γὰρ σὰρξ ἐφαίνετο, ἀηδῶς ἂν διακείμεθα πρὸς τὴν μετάληψιν. Νῦν δὲ, τῇ ἡμετέρα ἀσθενείᾳ συγκαταβαίνοντος τοῦ Κυρίου, τοιαύτη φαίνεται ἡμῖν ἡ μυστικὴ βρώσις, οἷα ἐστὶν ἡ συνήθης ἡμῖν. [P. 1309.] Οὐ γὰρ ψιλοῦ ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπου σὰρξ ἡ ἐσθιομένη, ἀλλὰ Θεοῦ καὶ Θεοποιεῖν δυναμένη, ὡς ἀνακραθεῖσα Θεότητι. [P. 1312, νν. 57—59, "He that eateth this bread," &c.] Ἐνταῦθα μανθάνομεν τὸ μυστήριον τῆς μεταλήψεως. Συνανάκρασις γὰρ ξενὴ καὶ ὑπὲρ λόγον γίνεται,

God should be in us and we in Himself! Dost thou not hear the terrific tidings? We do not eat bare God; for He is intangible and without a body and cannot be perceived by the eye or by the teeth: nor again do we eat bare human flesh; for it cannot profit at all; but since God united the flesh with Himself according to the ineffable mingling, His flesh also is of a life-giving nature; not that it has been translated (lit. gone over) into God's nature. Away with the thought! but it is after the similitude of iron that has been made red-hot, which both remaineth iron, and exhibits the energy of the fire too. So then the Lord's flesh also is life-giving, though it remaineth flesh, as the flesh of God the Word. As then, He says, I live by the Father (on account of the Father's ordering it) *i.e.* as begotten by the Father, Who is life, so He that eateth Me shall live by Me (on account of My ordering it), mingled in one as also transelemented into Me, Who have power to generate living beings. [This will be remembered in the Alexandrine Cyril, and in the Nyssene Gregory.] ... They were being offended [John] says. But the flesh, *i.e.* the carnal reception of these words, profiteth nothing... Thus indeed those that carnally hear the words being spoken by Christ were being offended ...

P. 794. On 1 Cor. xi. "Despise ye." "Thou doest an insult to the church and the place. By the cup, he says, thou fulfillest a remembrance of the Master's death... But there are two charges, both that the poor are being overlooked, and that ye drink to excess, by yourselves feeding on the things which ought to have been furnished for the poor also. But he said the word 'drunken' with

ὥστε εἶναι τὸν Θεὸν ἐν ἡμῖν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν Ἐαυτῷ. Οὐκ ἀκούεις φρικτὸν ἄκουσμα; Οὐ Θεὸν ψιλὸν τρώγομεν ἀνάφης γὰρ ἐστὶ καὶ ἀσώματος, καὶ οὔτε ὀφθαλμοῖς οὔτε ὁδουσίαν ἀλώσιμος· οὔδε πάλιν ψιλοῦ ἀνθρώπου σάρκα (οὐδὲν γὰρ ὠφελῆσαι δύναται)· ἀλλ', ἐπειδὴ ὁ Θεὸς ἦνωσεν Ἐαυτῷ τὴν σάρκα κατὰ τὴν ἀπορρήτὸν ἀνακράσιν, ζωποῖός ὑπάρχει καὶ ἡ σὰρξ, οὐχ ὅτι εἰς τὴν Θεοῦ φύσιν μετακεχώρηκεν· ἀπαγε; ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν ὁμοίωσιν τοῦ πεπυρωμένου σιδήρου, ὃς καὶ σίδηρος μένει, καὶ τὴν τοῦ πυρὸς δαίκνυσσι τὴν ἐνέργειαν. Οὕτως οὖν καὶ ἡ σὰρξ τοῦ Κυρίου ζωποῖός ἐστι, μένουσα σὰρξ, ὡς τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου σὰρξ. Ὡς περ οὖν, φησιν, Ἐγὼ ζῶ διὰ τὸν Πατέρα, τοῦτεστιν ὡς γεννηθεὶς διὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς, ὃς ἐστὶν ζωὴ, οὕτω καὶ ὁ τρώγων Ἐμὲ ζήσεται δι' Ἐμὲ, ἀνακρινάμενος, ὥστε καὶ μεταστοιχειούμενος εἰς Ἐμὲ, τὸν ζωογονεῖν ἰσχύοντα. [P. 1316, νν. 64, 65.] Ἐσκανδαλίζοντο, φησιν... Ἡ δὲ σὰρξ, τοῦτεστι τὸ σαρκικῶς αὐτὰ τὰ ῥήματα ἐκδέχεσθαι, οὐδὲν ὠφελεῖ... Οὕτω δὴ οἱ σαρκικῶς ἀκούοντες τῶν παρὰ Χριστοῦ λεγομένων ἐσκανδαλίζοντο.

Vol. II. p. 794. On 1 Cor. XI. 22.

"Despise ye the church of God," &c.

Εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ τὸν τόπον ὑβρίζεις. Διὰ τοῦ ποτηρίου, φησιν, ἀνάμνησιν τελεῖς τοῦ Δεσποτικοῦ θανάτου. V. 21. Δύο δὲ ἐγκλήματα, ὅτι τε παρορῶνται οἱ πένητες καὶ ὅτι ὑμεῖς μεθύετε, μόνοι σιτούμενοι ἃ εἶδει καὶ τοῖς πένησι παρεσκεύασθαι. Ἐμφατικῶς δὲ τὸ μεθύει εἶπε.

an emphasis... 'Partakers of the altar.' For also that which was being separated to God was being laid on the altar and burned up. But in the case of the body of Christ it is not so, but there is a sharing (communion) of Christ's body. For we do not become partakers (sharers) of the altar but on the contrary of Christ Himself.

P. 401. "In the case then of the old covenant Christ does not concede that the gift is greater than the altar; but in our case the altar is rather sanctified by the gifts; for the loaves are by Divine grace changed into that body of the Lord itself, wherefore also the altar is sanctified by them.

P. 436. "Though the law was commanding that one should be high-priest during life, they used to do many things in violation of the law, changing them annually... and the Gospel calls those high-priests that have already fulfilled the service for a year... Those that did not wish to kill Him in the feast, when they saw the betrayer, then they kill Him, having despised the multitude, only that His will may come to pass.

P. 645. "But it is Christ's body properly, that which is in the golden dish, and His blood that which is in the cup. Let him assuredly, who takes away the precious dish and compels Christ's body to be put in a cheaper dish, though he makes the poor his

[P. 685, ch. x. 18, "Partakers of the altar," &c.] Καὶ γὰρ τὸ Θεῶ ἀφορίζομενον, τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ ἐπιτιθέμενον, κατεκαίετο. Ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ οὐχ οὕτως, ἀλλὰ κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστιν. Οὐ γὰρ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου ἀλλ' Αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ κοινωνοὶ γινόμεθα.

*Vol. I. p. 401, En. in Matth. XXIII. 22.*

*On the gift and the altar.*

Ἐπὶ μὲν οὖν τῆς παλαιᾶς οὐ συγχωρεῖ ὁ Χριστὸς, μείζον εἶναι τὸ δῶρον τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου· ἐφ' ἡμῖν δὲ τὸ θυσιαστήριον ὑπὸ τῶν δώρων ἀγιάζεται μᾶλλον· εἰς γὰρ τὸ Δεσποτικὸν σῶμα αὐτὸ ἐκεῖνο μεταβάλλονται θεῖα χάριτι οἱ ἄρτοι· διὸ καὶ ἀγιάζεται ὑπὸ τούτων τὸ θυσιαστήριον.

*P. 436, c. XXVI. 2.*

Τοῦ νόμου κελεύοντος ἓνα εἶναι ἀρχιερέα διὰ βίον, πολλοὺς ἐποιοῦν αὐτοὶ παρανόμως, ἀμείβοντες κατ' ἐναντιόν... ἀρχιερεῖς δὲ λέγει τοὺς πεπληρηκότας ἤδη τὴν ἐνιαύσιον λειτουργίαν... Οἱ μὴ βουλόμενοι ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ φονεῖσαι Αὐτὸν, ὅτε εὗρον τὸν προδίδοντα τότε φονεύουσι, καταφρονήσαντες τοῦ ὄχλου, μόνον ἵνα τὸ θέλημα Αὐτοῦ συμβαίη.

*P. 645, in Marc. XIV. 6. On selling a golden paten for the poor.*

Χριστὸς δὲ σῶμα κυρίως, τὸ ἐν τῷ δίσκῳ τῷ χρυσῷ καὶ αἷμα τὸ ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ. Ὁ γοὺν ἀφαιρούμενος τὸν δίσκον τὸν πολυτίμον καὶ ἀναγκάζων τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν εὐτελεστέῳ τίθεσθαι, προφασιζόμενος δὲ τοῖς

pretext, know to what lot he belongs. [V. 16, 'This is My body.'] And it is this which ye now receive. For the bread is not a (mere) figure of the Lord's body but is changed into that body of Christ itself. For also the Lord saith, 'The bread which I will give is 'My flesh.' He did not say, It is a figure of My flesh, but it 'is My 'flesh': and again, 'Unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of man.' But how does He say it? for flesh is not seen. On account, O man, of our weakness. For since the bread indeed and the wine are customary things with us, but we could not have endured to see blood and flesh, but should have been paralysed (torpified) at it—on this account the kind Saviour who condescends to us, preserves indeed the appearance of bread and wine, but transelements it into the power of flesh and blood. 'Eat in My kingdom.' For He names the resurrection a kingdom, as He will then have reigned over death also ... But He drinks it new, *i.e.* in a new and strange way, for (then) He no longer had a body capable of suffering and wanting food, but on the contrary incorruptible and immortal.

P. 1110. "But when He concedes it, then their eyes are opened and they knew Him. But a different thing also is hinted<sup>1</sup>, that the eyes of those who partake of the blessed bread are opened so as to know Him. For the Lord's flesh has a great and unspeakable power.

<sup>1</sup> *Alvίττεται*, "is taught in a riddle."

πτωχούς, γνωσκέτω ποίας μερίδος ἔστιν. [V. 16—21, This is My body.] Καὶ τοῦτο ὃ νῦν λαμβάνετε. Οὐ γὰρ ἀντίτυπος τοῦ Κυρίου σώματος ἔστιν ὁ ἄρτος, ἀλλ' εἰς αὐτὸ ἐκείνο μεταβάλλεται τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Καὶ ὁ Κύριος γὰρ λέγει, "Ὁ ἄρτος ὃν Ἐγὼ δώσω ἡ σὰρξ Μοῦ ἔστιν." Οὐκ εἶπεν, "Ἀντίτυπος ἔστι τῆς σαρκὸς Μου, ἀλλ', Ἡ σὰρξ Μοῦ ἔστι." Καὶ πάλιν, "Ἐὰν μὴ φάγητε τὴν σάρκα τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου." Καὶ πῶς φησιν; οὐ γὰρ σὰρξ καθοράται. Διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν, ὦ ἄνθρωπε, ἀσθένειαν. Ἐπειδὴ μὲν γὰρ ὁ μὲν ἄρτος καὶ ὁ οἶνος συνήθη ἡμῖν, αἷμα δὲ καὶ σάρκα ὁρῶντες οὐκ ἂν ἠνέγκαμεν, ἀλλ' ἀπεναρκήσαμεν—διὰ τοῦτο ὁ συγκαταβαίνων ἡμῖν ὁ φιλόανθρωπος τὸ μὲν εἶδος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου φυλάττει, εἰς δύναμιν δὲ σαρκὸς καὶ αἵματος μεταστοιχειοῖ. As to eating, &c., in His kingdom. Βασιλείαν γὰρ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ὀνομάζει, ὡς βασιλεύσας τότε καὶ τοῦ θανάτου... Καινὸν δὲ πίνει αὐτὸ, τοῦτεστιν καινὸν τινα τρόπον καὶ ξένον, οὐκετι γὰρ σῶμα παθητὸν εἶχε, δεόμενον τροφῆς, ἀλλ' ἀφθαρτον καὶ ἀθάνατον.

P. 1110, *En. in Luc. c. XXIV. The two at Emmaus.*

"Οτε δὲ συγχωρεῖ τότε διανοίγονται οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπέγνωσαν Αὐτόν. Αἰνίττεται δέ τι καὶ ἕτερον, ὅτι τοῖς μεταλαμβάνουσι τοῦ εὐλογημένου ἄρτου διανοίγονται οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ εἰς τὸ ἐπιγινώσκειν Αὐτόν. Μεγάλην γὰρ καὶ ἄφατον δύναμιν ἔχει ἡ τοῦ Κυρίου σὰρξ.

P. 256. "But when the night was spent (completed) in these things, in the morning He is led to Pilate. [V. 28.] O for their folly! When they were indeed unjustly thirsting for his blood, they did not think they were being polluted by it, but by going to the judgment-hall they were thinking they should pollute themselves. But what is 'That they may eat the passover'? And yet the Lord celebrated that on the first day of unleavened bread. Either then we shall consider all the feast passover, the seven days, or they indeed were then about to eat it on the preparation day in the evening (after), [which, as it was not eaten till 9 P.M. would be part of the Sabbath-day]. But He delivered it one day before (i.e. on the evening of Thursday), reserving His own slaughter for the preparation-day at even [impossible, as he died at 3 P.M.], when also the old passover used to take place. [See the Thesis that opens Part I.]

Taking 1 Cor. xi. here we throw the four accounts together.

P. 441. "We say then that He first ate the passover standing; then that He reclined (with them) and delivered His own mystery. For having first fulfilled the typical passover, He thus fulfilled the true.

P. 684. "That is (the cup) of the eucharist. For holding it in our hands we bless and thank Him Who shed His blood for us, and thought us worthy of unspeakable good things. But (Paul) did not say participation but communion, that He might manifest something more, manifestly the height of union. But what he says is of such purport, that this that is in the cup is that which flowed

*P. 256. En. in Joh. XVIII.*

Τῆς δὲ νυκτὸς ἐν τούτοις ἀνυσθείσης, πρωίας πρὸς Πίλατον ἐπάγεται. V. 28, Ὡ τῆς ἀνοίας! Φονῶντες μὲν ἀδίκως οὐκ ἐνόμιζον μαινεσθαι· δικαστηρίων δὲ ἐπιβαίνοντες μαινέειν αὐτοὺς ἡγοῦντο. Τί δέ ἐστιν "ἵνα φάγωσι τὸ πάσχα"; Καὶ μὴν αὐτὸ ὁ Κύριος πεποιήκε τῇ πρώτῃ τῶν ἀζύμων. Ἡ οὖν πάσχα τὴν ἑορτὴν πᾶσαν νοήσομεν τὰς ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας, ἥτοι αὐτοὶ μὲν τότε ἐμελλον αὐτὸ φαγεῖν τῇ παρασκευῇ τῆς ἑσπέρας Αὐτοῦ δὲ πρὸ μίας αὐτὸ παρέδωκε, τηρῶν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ σφαγὴν τῇ παρασκευῇ, ἑσπέρας, ὅτε καὶ τὸ παλαιὸν ἐγίνετο τὸ πάσχα.

*I. p. 441, Matth. XXVI. 26.*

Φάμεν οὖν ὅτε ἔφαγε πρῶτον τὸ πάσχα ἱστάμενος· εἶτα ἀναπεσὼν παρέδωκεν τὸ οἰκεῖον μυστήριον. Πρῶτον γὰρ τὸ τυπικὸν τελέσας, οὕτω τὸ ἀληθινὸν ἐπετέλεσε.

*II. p. 684, 1 Cor. X. 16. "The cup of blessing," &c.*

Τούτεστι τῆς εὐχαριστίας. Ἐπὶ χεῖρας γὰρ αὐτὸ ἔχοντες εὐλογοῦμεν καὶ εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ τὸ αἷμα Αὐτοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐκχέαντι καὶ ἀρρήτων ἀγαθῶν ἀξιώσαντι. Οὐκ εἶπε δὲ μετοχῇ, ἀλλὰ κοινωνία, ἵνα πλέον τι δηλώσῃ, τὴν ἄκραν ἔνωσην δηλαδὴ. Ὁ δὲ λέγει τοιοῦτόν ἐστιν, ὅτι τοῦτο

from His side; and when we partake of it we also communicate, i.e. are made one with Christ... 'The bread which,' &c. That which Christ has (not) suffered on the cross (for a bone of Him was not broken) this He now endures, being broken into pieces by us. 'The bread which we break,' instead of 'As that body has 'seen made one with Christ, so we also are made one with Him through that bread.' 'We being many,' &c. Since Paul said, It is the communion of the body, but to communicate is different from that which one communicates, he now shews the greater thing and says that we are that body itself. (Does he not say this?) For what is the bread? Christ's body. But what do the participants become? Christ's body, not many bodies but one body. For as the bread becomes one out of many seeds, 'so, we, being 'many, are one body.' [St Paul means and says union in Christ with one another, which Theophylact 'adds to.'] 'We all partake,' &c. As we also are one body. How then is it we do not guard love and become one in this also? And yet God at least, he says, gives us one body for this, that He may make us one, both with Himself and with one another. For since the former nature of the flesh was destroyed by sin and became destitute of life, He gave to us the sinless and living flesh, but like to us, flesh, that partaking of it we may be mingled up with it and live without sinning, as can be.

P. 699. "As they that at the beginning believed used to be

τὸ ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ ὃν ἐκεῖνό ἐστι τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς πλεύρας ρεύσαν· καὶ ἐκεῖνον μεταλαμβάνοντες καὶ κοινωνοῦμεν, τοῦτεστιν ἐνούμεθα τῷ Χριστῷ. [It is generally now admitted that this is not the true sense of this verb. It is "sharing in Christ," and so being sharers *with* each other.] On "The bread which," &c. "Ὅπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ πέπονθεν ὁ Χριστός (ὅσπου γὰρ αὐτοῦ οὐ συνετρίβη), τοῦτο νῦν ὑπομένει, δι' ἡμᾶς κατακλῶμενος. The bread which, &c., ἀντὶ τοῦ, Ὅσπερ ἐκεῖνο τὸ σῶμα ἦν τῷ Χριστῷ, οὕτω καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ ἄρτου τούτου ἐνούμεθα. V. 19, "We being "many," &c. Ἐπειδὴ εἶπε, Κοινωνία τοῦ σώματός ἐστι, τὸ δὲ κοινωνεῖν ἑτερόν ἐστιν ἐκεῖνου οὐ κοινωνεῖ, νῦν δείκνυσσι τὸ μῆζον, καὶ φησιν ὅτι αὐτὸ ἐσμὲν ἐκεῖνο τὸ σῶμα. Τί γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ἄρτος; Σῶμα Χριστοῦ. Τί δὲ γίνονται οἱ μεταλαμβάνοντες; Σῶμα Χριστοῦ, οὐχὶ σώματα πολλά, ἀλλὰ σῶμα ἓν. Κάθαρπερ γὰρ ὁ ἄρτος ἐκ πολλῶν κόκκων εἰς γίνεται, "So we "being many," &c. "For we all partake of," &c. Ὅστε καὶ σῶμα ἓν ἐσμὲν. Πῶς οὖν οὐ φυλάττομεν τὴν ἀγαπὴν καὶ γινόμεθα καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο ἓν; καίτοι γε ὁ Θεός, φησι, τὸ σῶμα διὰ τοῦτο δίδωσιν ἡμῖν, ἵνα ἐνώσῃ ἡμᾶς, καὶ πρὸς ἑαυτὸν καὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἡ πρότερα τῆς σαρκὸς φύσις ἐφθάρη ὑπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ ζωῆς ἐγένετο ἔρημος, ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν τὴν ἀναμάρτον καὶ ζωερὰν, ὁμοίαν δὲ ἡμῖν, σάρκα, ὡς ἂν αὐτῆς μεταλαμβάνοντες, πρὸς αὐτὴν ἀνακραθῶμεν καὶ ζήσωμεν ἀναμαρτήτως [Gregory of Nyssa, &c.] ὡς ἔνεστι.

P. 699. "Shall I praise you," &c., v. 17.

Ὅσπερ οἱ ἐν ἀρχῇ πιστεύσαντες κοινὰ πάντα ἔχοντες κοινῇ ἐστιῶντο·

entertained in common, having all things common, so after a certain imitation of them, though not exact, in Corinth during some specified days, perhaps days of festival, they were having a banquet after having partaken of the mysteries, the rich indeed bringing in their provisions, and the poor being invited by them and being entertained. V. 22. Paul says, You do not care so much about the poor as not to nourish yourselves; so far that they are rebuked and put to shame, at not themselves having wealth, while you honourably recline opposite them and become drunken.

P. 283. "Surely on account of His manhood Paul said the word 'intercede.' For Paul condescending to the hearers says, Fear not. He both loves us and He has confidence towards the Father. But He cannot always stand by us. Say not this, for He liveth and always can do His priestly work for us. But when I say (His) manhood I do not divide it from the Godhead (for there is one person of both), but I give to the hearers fit thoughts to entertain regarding both natures. But this very thing, that the Son is sitting together with the Father wearing flesh (still), is an intercession for us, as if the flesh were sad with the Father on our behalf, as for this very purpose taken (to the Father or to Heaven) on account of our salvation.

P. 317. "It is manifest that they were too weak to accomplish it. And on this account they used to offer after the first a second

οὕτω κατὰ τινα μίμησιν τούτων, εἰ καὶ μὴ ἀκριβῆ, ἐν Κορίνθῳ κατὰ τινὰς ῥητὰς ἡμέρας, ἑορτίους ἰσως, κοινῇ εὐωχοῦντο μετὰ τὸ μεταλαβεῖν τῶν μυστηρίων [a curious difference of opinion but worth considering as probable at times] τῶν μὲν πλουτιῶντων εἰσφερόντων τὰ ἐδέσματα, τῶν δὲ πενήτων ὑπ' αὐτῶν καλουμένων καὶ ἐστιωμένων. V. 22, Shame them that have not. Οὐ τοσοῦτόν, φησι, μέλει τοῖς πένητιν ὅτι οὐ τρέφετε αὐτοὺς, ὅσον ὅτι κατασχύνονται, ἐλεγχόμενοι ἐπὶ τῷ μὴ αὐτοὶ ἔχειν, ὑμῶν φιλοτίμως ἀνακειμένων καὶ μεθύοντων.

III. P. 283, *Heb. VIII. 25*, "*Seeing He ever liveth,*" &c.

Διὰ γοῦν τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα τὸ, "ἐντυγχάνειν," εἶπε. Συγκαταβαίνων γὰρ τοῖς ἀκούουσιν ὁ Παῦλος, Μὴ δέισητέ, φησι· καὶ φιλεῖ μὲν ἡμᾶς καὶ παρῆρσιαν ἔχει πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα. Ἄλλ' οὐκ αἰεὶ δύναται παρίστασθαι ἡμῶν. Μὴ τοῦτο εἶπητε· ζῇ γὰρ καὶ αἰεὶ δύναται τὸ ἱερατικὸν ἔργον ποιεῖν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν. Ὅταν δὲ ἀνθρωπότητα εἶπω, οὐ διαίρω αὐτὴν τῆς Θεότητος (μία γὰρ ὑπόστασις ἀμφοῖν) ἀλλὰ δίδωμι τοῖς ἀκούουσι τὰ πρέποντα τὰ περὶ ἑκάτερας φύσεως ἐννοεῖν. Καὶ αὐτὸ δὲ τοῦτο, τὸ σάρκα φοροῦντα Υἱὸν συγκαθῆσθαι τῷ Πατρὶ, ἔντευξίς ἐστιν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, ὥσανεὶ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν δυσωπούσης τῷ Πατρὶ, ὡς δι' αὐτὸ τοῦτο προσληφθείσης πάντως, διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν.

P. 317 D, *Heb. X. 1*, "*Can never with those,*" &c.

Πρόδηλον ὅτι ἡσθένουν τελειῶσαι. Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μετὰ τὴν πρώτην θυσίαν δευτέραν καὶ ἄλλην μετ' αὐτὴν προσέφερον. Ὡσπερ καὶ τῶν φαρμά-

and another after it. For it is as of medicines, those indeed are strong which once applied cure, but those that are often applied there, are shewn to be not strong. But the question is asked, What then? Are not we also always bringing bloodless sacrifices? Yes; but we are making a remembrance of His death. And it is one, not many, since it was offered once for all. For we are always offering the same, but rather we are making a remembrance of that offering, as if it were now taking place. So that the sacrifice is one."

*κων ισχυρά μὲν ὅσα ἅπαξ ἐπιτιθέντα θεραπεύει, τὰ δὲ πολλάκις ἐπιτιθέμενα αὐτόθι, δηλοῦνται ἀνισχυρά. Ζητεῖται δὲ, Τί οὖν; Οὐχὶ καὶ ἡμεῖς αἰὲν θυσίας ἀναιμάκτους προσφέρομεν; Ναί. Ἀλλὰ ἀνάμνησιν ποιούμεθα τοῦ θανάτου. Καὶ μία ἐστὶν αὐτῇ οὐ πολλαὶ, ἐπεὶδὴ ἅπαξ προσηνέχθη. Τὸν γὰρ αὐτὸν αἰὲ προσφέρομεν, μᾶλλον δὲ ἀνάμνησιν τῆς προσφορᾶς ἐκείνης ποιούμεν, ὡς νῦν γινομένης. Ὡστε μία ἐστὶν ἡ θυσία.*

(N.) ABBOT RUPERT OF DUYTZ (TUY). D. 1135.

When a traveller approaches Cologne, his mind is divided between two opposing attractions. He may and probably in most cases will plant himself as near as possible to the great cathedral growing now rapidly up to a perfection, which surpasses every building of pure Gothic, or, as Dr Whewell proposed to call it, Christian architecture. But exactly in front of Cologne on the eastern side of the Rhine there rises on the high bank of the river Rupert's little town, from whose elevation are seen the whole of the great Cologne and the southern expanse of the rapid river. This Rupert's life is to us almost entirely in his works. We first hear of him in the Benedictine Abbey near Liege in 1108 studying under the great Wazo, Bishop of Liege. The Scriptures seem from the first to have been the centre of all his researches and acquisitions. His first exploit was against propagators of a wicked folly which attributed the origin of evil to God, making God will the fall of Adam. The darkest pit is said to have some stray light in it, and so it were not difficult to define the one ray of truth that is to be discerned in the midnight of this heresy. Rupert's attack on this erring philosophy seems to have not only drawn a nest of hornets upon him, but also to have secured him some noble and precious friends. His abbot in dying recommended Rupert to Cuno, Abbot of Sigberg; and he passed him on with high approval



to a much greater prelate, Frederic the prince Archbishop of Cologne itself: and he at once set him up on the dignified eminence of the abbot of the convent of Deutz. There he lived and laboured fifteen years and he died there. His age at his death is not known: but it was in A.D. 1101 that he entered the order of priests. He was born in the territory belonging to Ypres.

He wrote commentaries of power on nearly all the Bible: but, as our extracts will abundantly shew, he had not outgrown the childish mythicism, which almost brings the charge of antiquated folly on the books of God: nor does our special subject escape at his hands without a full share of these fanciful dreamings of secret senses. He published some valuable histories, including an account of a great fire at Deutz in 1128, also some works of an ascetical and mystic cast: but his two great works are a Glorification of the Trine Godhead, and a dialogue between a Jew and a Christian. Great divines differ about his opinions on the Lord's supper. Bellarmine asserts that he held that only persons of true heart-belief received the true and real body of Christ in this sacrament; but Neander decides that Rupert rejected the dogma of Transubstantiation, and held little more than Luther: and others of considerable name on both sides have come to the same opinion. Sufficient citations are given to put it in the power of every reader to see for himself how far Rupert advanced towards Reformation-truth, and how far he still clung to the generally received antichristian errors. Scharpff's principal grounds for the latter are given in seven passages in the *Dictionnaire Encyclopédique*. I insert them after my own selections.

It is thought that his works slept unregarded and unknown for 40 years. Their standing editions are that of Venice 1751 in four folios, and that of the all-embracing Migne, in the same number of his super-royal octavos.

P. 329. "On the Trinity. Abel offered of his flock the firstlings and fatlings, because the true sacrifice which our High Priest Jesus Christ instituted on that night, although in external appearance it be bread and wine, is in truth the Lamb of God, first-

---

*Opera, Migne, Vol. I., p. 329, De Trinitate, &c., Gen. IV. v. 4.*

Abel obtulit de primitiis gregis sui et adipibus eorum, quia vere sacrificium quod illâ nocte Pontifex noster Jesus Christus instituit, quamvis exteriori specie panis et vinum sit; in veritate Agnus Dei

begotten of all the lambs or sheep which pertain to the folds of Heaven, to the passover of paradise. And this is to be noted, &c., for this true sacrifice of bread and wine is not only flesh and blood and spirit and life, because it is the true Word Which is incarnate and is true Godhead in bread and wine, &c. [The sentences are too affluent for me to give them entire.]

On Exod. iii. and 1 Tim. iii. "I indeed read in the former, bread of Heaven, bread of angels, in the singular, but in the latter, 'I will rain on you bread (loaves);' it is said in the plural... Therefore in relation to Himself Christ is one bread, or one body of Christ, but in relation to the churches of particular places and in relation to the persons of the offerers or the innumerable peoples of recipients you would rightly call Him a magazine of food or bread in the plural. [C. XI.] Besides, if we would eat worthily, let us come out from all curious enquiry about bodily sense, so as not to think we have to come to decisions, that is to say by sight, taste, smell and touch, whether it be Christ's true body, and whether that which we are receiving be true flesh. For though those things remain—the colour, scent and taste (of bread), there is still enough for faith and enough for catholic piety. For that the two things should be visibly changed to a new kind, the latter into the flesh of a sheep, the other into horrid blood, 'does not profit at all,' yea and it is unbelieving to think it.

P. 907. "Some one says, How then will the holy fathers (i.e.

---

est, primogenitus omnium agnorum vel ovium quæ pertinent ad caulas cœli ad pascha paradisi. [C. V.] Et notandum, &c. Etenim hoc verum panis et vini sacrificium non modo caro et sanguis sed spiritus et vita est, quia Verbum verum, Quod incarnatum est, et vera Divinitas in pane et vino est, &c.

On Exod. III. 10, and "Great is the mystery," &c., 1 Tim. III.

Equidem illic panem cœli, panem angelorum, singulariter; hic autem "Ego pluam vobis panes." Pluraliter dictum est... Ergo secundum Se panis unus Christus, vel unum corpus Christi, veruntamen secundum locales ecclesias et secundum offerentium personas sive accipientium innumerabiles populos cibaria, sive panes, recte dicas pluraliter. [C. XI.] Præterea si digne manducare cupimus, ab omni curiositate corporei sensus egrediamur, ut videlicet visu gustu odoratu et tactu dijudicandum non esse arbitremur an verum sit corpus Christi, an vera sit caro id quod sumimus. Nam istis permanentibus, colore odore atque sapore, est quod sufficiat fidei, quod satis est catholicæ pietati... Nam mutari visibiliter in speciem novam, hoc in ovinam carnem, illud in sanguinis horrorem, "non prodest quidquam," imo et infidum est.

Vol. II. Comm. on Sol. Song. p. 907,

On John VI., "I will raise him up," &c.

Dicit aliquis, Sancti itaque patres quomodo vivent qui non come-

of the Old Testament) live, who did not eat nor drink this sacrament of life, except only in a figure, and in one generation, when they ate manna in the desert and drank water from the rock following them? To this I say, The wisdom of God provides for you while you live as He provided for them, now dead, after their own manner, and prepared the same table for them. Since they have been dissipated, whose spirits are indeed in the lower regions in the hope of rest, but their bodies rest in the tombs, and I, 'the 'living Bread, Who came down from Heaven,' shall be dissipated too, John vi., and My soul indeed will go down to their souls, but My body to their own bodies, that is to say into the womb of that earth, by which their bodies have been received.

P. 1547. "But some one says, That blood had not been shed yet, but it was shed on the following day, in which the apostles themselves also must be cleansed, though He gave to them on that first night this food and this drink. For this I say, that Lamb of God had already been sold, that calf of a true sacrifice was now being betrayed, and on his account they were being held rightly clean ... 'And the bread,' &c. Yet you would reasonably say this, that even that term bread is rightly said for Him, and is truly Christ's flesh, because (as the bread remains) for us who had not yet been born, for us who are alive and who succeed from the apostles themselves, the same bread itself eaten by us does the same for us as the flesh of Christ crucified in its own appearance

derunt neque biberunt hoc vitæ sacramentum nisi tantum in figurâ et in generatione unâ, quando "manna in deserto comederunt," et aquam de consequente eos petrâ biberunt? Ad hæc inquam sicut viventibus vobis pro modo vestro, ita defunctis illis pro modo ipsorum Sapiëntia Dei providit, eandemque mensam paravit. Siquidem dissipati sunt illi, quoniam animæ quidem apud inferos sunt in requiei spe, corpora vero requiescunt in sepulchris, dissipabor et Ego, "panis vivus Qui "de cœlo descendi," John vi., et anima quidem ad animas illorum, corpus vero descendet ad corpora ipsorum, scilicet in ejus terræ ventrem quo illa recepta sunt.

P. 1547.

Matth. Sed dicit aliquis, Nondum erat fusus ille sanguis, sed fusus est die sequenti, quo et ipsos apostolos oportebat emundari, quibus primis illâ nocte hanc escam et hunc potum dedit. Ad hæc inquam, jam venditus erat iste Agnus Dei, jam tradebatur iste vitulus sacrificii veri, et idcirco recte mundi habebantur... "And the bread "which I will give," &c. John vi. Hoc tamen rationabiliter dixeris, quod vel pro Eo panis iste recte dicatur et vere sit caro Christi, quia nobis residuis qui nondum eramus nati, nobis viventibus sive venientibus ab ipsis apostolis, idem facit ipse comesus panis quod illis prioribus

and dying and buried did for those former saints. It conferred remission of sins, &c., &c.

P. 488. Commentary on St John. "But if any one ask from us how bread created this year from the earth is the body of Christ that hung upon the cross, and wine expressed from grapes of the present time is His blood which He shed from His own side, let us ask him how the Son of man, also conceived of a woman and born of earth, descended from Heaven, or how before He ascended into Heaven He could have been already in Heaven? [To think of this great abbot seeing no distinction between the Divine and the human natures!]

P. 469. "For the unity of the Word makes Christ's body one, so that that (body) which then hung upon the cross and that (body) which now the church's faith makes by sacred words, is one body, is I say one flesh and one blood. [Dexterous, if only it be body.]

P. 480. "Since My Father's guests have been dissipated by death and I shall be dissipated too Who am angels' bread, and according to that substance on which angels feed, shall go to the lower realm, where their souls are hungering; and laid up as regards the body in the same womb of the earth, in which their bodies have been laid up, &c.

sanctis fecit in suâ specie crucifixa, moriens et sepulta caro Christi. Remissionem peccatorum contulit, &c.

*Vol. III. p. 488, Comm. in Johan.*

Quod si quis a nobis quærat, Quomodo panis, qui hoc anno de terrâ creatur, corpus Christi sit quod in cruce pependit, et vinum quod præsentibus expressum est acinis ille sanguis Ejus est, quem de latere Suo fudit? Interrogemus eum quomodo Filius hominis, qui utique de fœmina conceptus et de terrâ natus est, de cœlo descenderit; vel quomodo antequam in cœlum ascenderet jam in cœlo esse potuerit?

*P. 469.*

Unitas enim Verbi unum efficit corpus Christi, ut illud, quod tunc in cruce pependit et istud quod nunc ecclesiæ fides ore sacro conficit, unum corpus sit, una inquam caro et unus sanguis sit.

*P. 480.*

Quoniam convivæ Patris Mei per mortem dissipati sunt, &c., dissipabor et Ego panis angelorum et secundum illam substantiam quâ pascuntur angeli, pergam ad inferos, ubi eorum animæ esuriunt, et secundum corpus eodem terræ ventre reconditus quo recondita sunt corpora illorum, &c.

P. 483. "But what is a sacrament, or whence is it so called except from consecrating, in that it consecrates the body of Christ, i.e. the church mixed with it, and, by consecrating, effects its unity? 'Do this,' &c. Further, we undoubtedly believe that all the clouds of figures or similitudes being removed, we eat not any kind of body that comes, nor that body of Christ which the church is, but that body of the Lord which was betrayed for us and drink that blood which was shed for us, &c. [P. 484.] For neither is there any difference between the fault of not believing that those that ate of the forbidden tree died and that of not believing that those that eat My flesh and drink My blood in the prescribed rule are delivered from the same death...lest any one should think that without the visible food and drink of His body and blood he has recovered the life both of His body and soul by faith alone, &c. [P. 485. 'Ye shall be,' &c. 'He that eateth,' &c.] Here He plainly makes a promise of His Godhead to them that eat His own flesh and drink His own blood, &c. He has not used the words of the same deceiver, 'Ye shall be as gods.'... For who is or can be as God also is? Thus an angel wished to be God and he became the devil.

P. 490. "Christ daily suffers and dies as often as that bread is broken in commemoration of Him; and here they say, The word is a hard one, &c.

P. 483.

Quid autem est vel unde dicitur sacramentum nisi a sacrando, eo quod remistum, i.e. corpus Christi quod est ecclesia consecret et consecrando efficiat unitatem... "Do this," &c. Luke xxii. Proinde cunctis figurarum vel similitudinum nebulis remotis non corpus quodlibet, non corpus Christi quod est ecclesia, sed illud corpus Domini, quod pro nobis traditum est, nos manducare et illum sanguinem, qui pro nobis fusus est in remissionem peccatorum, nos bibere indubitanter credimus: [and p. 484] Nec enim differt in culpâ non credidisse quod manducantes de ligno vetito morentur, et non credere quod manducantes carnem Meam et bibentes sanguinem Meum, ordine præscripto, ab eâdem morte liberentur... Ne quis existimet se absque corporis et sanguinis Ejus cibo potuque visibili vitam utramque corporis et animæ solâ fide recuperasse, &c. [The Trentines probably knew this passage.] P. 485, On Gen. iii. "Ye shall be as gods," &c., Rupert quotes, "He that eateth my flesh," &c. Hic perspicue Divinitatem pollicetur carnem Suam manducantibus et sanguinem Suum bibentibus, &c. Non ejusdem deceptoris verbis usus est dicentis, Eritis sicut Di... Quis enim est vel esse potest sicut et Deus?...Sic angelus voluit esse Deus et factus est diabolus.

P. 490.

Quotidie Christus patitur et toties moritur quoties panis iste in commemorationem Ejus frangitur. Et hic, inquirunt, "sermo durus est;" and p. 491 A.

P. 493. "Nestorius being ignorant of this forbad that the blessed Mary should be called mother of God, and said that Christ's nature was not from Divine but only of human flesh. Thus he wickedly divided one Christ into two Christs, the one God and the other man; when the same Son of Man was in Heaven before, whither He afterwards ascended, &c. [Is this pure Cyrilism? The latter part of the sentence returns to good sense. Why should not John iii. 13, The Son of Man which is in Heaven mean, 'Who as to His Godhead is in Heaven'? All great Protestant divines say His manhood was not then in Heaven: for it could not in itself be in two places at once. Our church openly subscribes to this judgment.]

P. 333. The fire in the town of Deutz. "'All things,' &c. So now too it happened. I wish to tell the whole as it happened, intending posterity to know, and that no antiquity may be able to abolish from our hearts the memory of the way in which the sacrament of the Lord's body was glorified in so great a conflagration, as our eyes beheld, and of the way in which this temple in which we invoke the name of the Lord was freed from the pressing flame, so that the presence of the Divine protection was seen by many, that is to say, the appearance of a most fair man leaning down from above and putting forth his hand and repelling the impetus of the circumfluent sea of flame. [P. 335.] One of the brethren bearing a corporal of the Lord's table caught out of

P. 493. On "*The Son of Man which is in Heaven.*"

Quod ignorans Nestorius... beatam Mariam vetuit vocari Dei genitricem, et quod Christi non Divinâ sed humanâ tantum de carne ejus sumpta sit natura. Ita Christum unum in duos Christos, alterum Deum alterumque hominem male divisit; cum idem Filius hominis et prius fuerit in cœlo, quo post modum ascendit, &c.

Vol. iv. p. 111, long citation from libellus Romani ordinis de consecratione chrismatis, with ampullæ, jars, half uncovered, and their meaning.

Vol. IV., p. 333. *De incendio oppidi Tuitii.*

On Rom. VIII. "*All things work together,*" &c.

Ita accidit et nunc. Rem ipsam ut gesta est enarrare libet, hac intentione ut sciant nostri quoque posterius, et nulla temporum vetustas abolere possit de cordibus nostris memoriam glorificationis, quâ glorificatum est in tanto incendio sacramentum corporis Domini, sicut viderunt oculi nostri, et liberationis quâ liberatum est a pressurâ flammæ templum hoc in quo invocamus nomen Domini, taliter ut a multis visa sit præsentia Divinæ protectionis, videlicet quasi species hominis pulcherrimi desuper incumbentis et circumfluentium flammarum impetum manu objectâ repellentis. [P. 335.] Quidam e fratribus raptum e sacrario ferens corporale Dominicum longo hastili

the chancel fastened in the upper part to a long spear, threw it as if he would pierce the raging fire, until the flame rebelling broke forth against him and nearly caught him in its blast. Then at length withdrawing and drawing back the spear which he held partly consumed, but the corporal, wonderful to tell! uninjured, and unstained by the flames, he quickly let go, and cast it enveloped in flames as high as he could, desiring and hoping that by its being thrown with the will of God the fire might be overcome and give in as if it were strangled. But that great fire permitted too by God in a marvellous manner with secret unaccountable force, threw back the corporal whole and thrust it back further off into that part of the town, which had not been conceded to it, and where as became manifest it was to injure nothing. Finally the corporal just spoken of was brought back to such a degree entire and uninjured that it had yet a not unbecoming mark on it, *i.e.* a line of a slightly reddish hue, being itself, as it was before, all white. Another pyx with unconsecrated hosts in it, a jar for wine also and the pewter vessels or cases of tin themselves, and a little vase of incense and candles, and some flax-wicks (perished), but that pyx alone with the body of the Lord in it remained safe and untouched. [There is more; but enough has been given to lead to the conclusion that if such a man as Rupert saw all this, it is hard to guess what the common people did not see.]

John v. (1), "Some one might eat it unworthily: but no one ought. For bread, once for all consecrated, never afterwards loses

*superne illigatum... threw the spear with it into the fire, quasi sævientem confoderet ignem donec usque ad ipsum prorupit flamma rebellis eumque pæne afflavit. Tunc demum absistens et hastile quod tenebat partim ambustum, corporale autem illæsum mirum dictum! et incontaminatum ignibus abstrahens quantocius absolvit et convolutum flammis, quo potuit altius iniecit, optans et sperans quod ex immissione Ejus volente Domino opprimeretur et deficeret quasi strangulatus ignis. At ille videlicet magnus et a Deo permissus ignis miro modo corporale integrum occultâ et incognitâ vi rejectit et longius repulit in eam villæ partem quæ sibi concessa non fuerat et ubi sicut manifestum est, nihil nociturus erat... Denique corporale jam dictum sic integrum et illæsum relatum est, ut tamen signum habeat non indecorum videlicet lineam subrufam, cum sit ipsum, ut prius erat, totum candidum. [C. V.] Alia pyxis hostias continens non consecratas, ampulla quoque vinaria et ipsa stagnæa et vasculum thuris et candelæ et aliquod lini. The flame seized on everything else as it were the fire of Babylon. Sola autem pyxis illa cum corpore Dominico incolumis et intacta permansit.*

Scharpff in the Dict. Encycl. cites seven passages. (1) Non nemo indigne manducare potest, sed nemo indigne manducare debet. Panis namque semel consecratus, nunquam postea virtutem sanctificationis

the consecration's virtue, or ceases to be Christ's flesh : but it does not at all benefit an unworthy man, whose faith without works is dead : and therefore has not the Spirit that gives life to receive it with his mouth. But a worthy communicant has this advantage over an unworthy, that it benefits the former to salvation, and on the latter it brings judgment. (2) And when the priest distributes it in the mouth of the faithful, the bread and wine is consumed and passes away. For the offspring of the virgin together with the Word of the Father united to it remains (at once) in Heaven and among men entire and unconsumed. (3) But nothing out of the sacrifice, except the visible appearances of bread and wine, reaches him in whom there is no faith. (4) Because the virgin conceived Him of the Holy Spirit Who is the eternal fire, and He Himself by the same Spirit offered Himself a live victim to the living God, He is roasted in the same fire on the altar. For by the operation of the Holy Spirit the bread becomes the body, the wine the blood of Christ. You will therefore eat it only roast with fire, *i.e.* you will attribute it entirely to the operation of the Holy Spirit, Whose action is not to destroy or corrupt whatever substance He takes for His own uses, but to add to the good in the substance, which good remains as it was indivisibly, that which before was not (or which it was not—Dominican). As the Spirit did not destroy the human nature when it joined it by an operation of His own from the virgin's womb to God the Word into a oneness of person, so He does not change or destroy the substance of bread and wine as to outward appearance and subject to our five senses, when He joins them to the same Word into a

---

*amittit, aut Christi caro esse desinit; sed non prodest quidquam indigno, cujus fides sine operibus mortua est; et ideo Spiritum Qui vivificat non habet, quo ore percipiat... Sed hoc plus habet dignus ab indigno, quod huic ad salutem, illi profecit ad iudicium. (2) Quod (sacrificium) cum in ore fidelium sacerdos distribuit, panis et vinum absumitur et transit. Partus enim virginis cum unito sibi Verbo Patris in cœlo et in hominibus integer manet et inconsumptus. (3) Sed in illum, in quo fides non est, præter visibiles species panis et vini nihil de sacrificio pervenit. (4) In Exod. l. II. c. 10. Quia de Spiritu sancto, Qui æternus est ignis, virgo illum concepit, et Ipse per eundem Spiritum sanctum obtulit Semet hostiam vivam Deo viventi, eodem igni assatur in altari. Operatione namque Spiritus sancti panis corpus, vinum fit sanguis Christi... Itaque comedetis assum tantum igni, *i.e.* totum attribuetis operationi Spiritus sancti, Cujus effectus non est destruere vel corrumpere substantiam, quæcumque Suos in usus assumit, sed substantiæ bono permanenti quod erat indivisibiliter adjicere quod non erat. Sicut naturam hominum non destruit (destruxit), cum illam operatione Suâ ex utero virginis Deus Verbo in unitatem personæ conjunxit, sic substantiam panis et vini secundum exteriorem speciem quinque sensibus subactam, non mutat aut destruit, cum eidem Verbo in unitatem*



oneness of the same body that hung on the cross and of the same blood that He shed from His own side. Also as the Word let down from on high was made flesh and not changed into flesh but by taking flesh to it, so both bread and wine raised from the lowest become Christ's body and blood, not changed into the taste of flesh nor into horrid blood, but by invisibly assuming the truth of both substances which are in Christ, *i.e.* His Divine and human. Further, as we daily and in catholic form shall confess the man Who was received in the virgin and hung upon the cross, so we truly call this which we take from the sacred altar, Christ, and proclaim Him the Lamb of God. (5) The bread brought into and immersed in the terrible mystery of Christ's passion, seems still to be that which was bread, and yet in truth is Christ Which was not (bread). (6) Both species (kinds) of the bread and of the wine are taken from the earth: but God the Creator of substances and appearances and the Former of the Holy Spirit [unscriptural language] is added to it, and superinduces the gold of the incarnate Word (the gold of Christ crucified dead and buried, and after His glorious resurrection taken up into Heaven to God's right hand,) not on the surface only, but efficaciously turns them into His flesh and blood, although with the outer appearance remaining. (7) Let us believe in the faithful Saviour God, where we do not see Him, *i.e.* that the bread and wine have passed over into the true substance of body and blood, and eating and drinking let us live for ever."

---

corporis ejusdem quod in cruce pependit et sanguinis ejusdem quod de latere Suo fudit, ista conjungit. Item quomodo Verbum a summo demissum caro factum est non mutatum in carnem sed assumendo carnem, sic panis et vinum utrumque ab imo sublevatum fit corpus Christi et sanguis, non mutatum in carnis saporem nec in sanguinis horrorem, sed assumendo invisibiliter utriusque (Divinæ sc. et humanæ) quæ in Christo est substantiæ veritatem. Proinde, sicut hominem, Qui in virgine sumptus in cruce pependit, recte et catholice confitemur, sic veraciter hoc, quod sumimus de sancto altari, Christum dicimus agnum Dei prædicamus. (5) Gen. vii. 32. Panis admotus et immersus terribili mysterio passionis Christi adhuc videtur esse panis quod erat, et tamen in veritate Christus est quod non erat. (6) Exod. i. iv. c. 7. Species utræque, panis et vini, de terrâ sumuntur...sed accedit substantiarum atque specierum Creator Deus atque Formator Spiritus Sancti, aurumque Verbi incarnati, aurum Christi crucifixi mortui ac sepulti atque post gloriosam resurrectionem assumpti in cœlum ad dexteram Patris, non superficie tenus inducit, sed efficaciter hæc in carnem et sanguinem Ejus convertit, permanente licet specie exteriori. (7) Scharpf also quotes a letter to Cuno printed in the Cologne and Nuremberg edition. Credamus fidei Salvatori Deo in eo quod non videmus, sc. panem et vinum in veram corporis et sanguinis transisse substantiam, et comedentes atque bibentes vivamus in æternum.

I have in one case previously ventured to translate "transire" in a different way from that in which I suppose it must be translated in these passages from Rupert. Sometimes, but very seldom, the real meaning of a word seems uncertain.

(O.) ST STEPHEN, THIRD CISTERCIAN ABBOT. ABB. 1109.

This powerful branch of the Benedictine order was indeed first founded by Robert, of noble family in Champagne, but he left its head-quarters, Cîteaux, and returned to his earlier abbey of Molesme and died there. But it was Stephen, the successor of his successor Alberic, to whom its after-greatness is to be ascribed. Cîteaux is a wasted district, but it had an attractive force in its numerous cisterns, for which it is adapted, and from which it is named. The French name is *Ordre des Cîteaux*; see *Dict. Encyclopéd.* on the word. In rivalry of the brown tunic of the Cluniac order, founded by Peter of Cluny, the Cistercians wore a white tunic, but retained the brown scapulary with its hood or head-covering. When it is added that Stephen's name was Harding, it is unnecessary to add that he was of English race. He began his course as a monk at Molesme; but Cîteaux monastery being in a wilder district had more powerful attraction for him; and when he had become abbot, the superabundance of monks hived off (1) to La Ferté in the diocese of Chalons, (2) to Pontigny in that of Auxerre, (3) to Clairvaux, which lives in immortal remembrance from having had the greatest of all St Bernards as its president, and (4) to Morimond in the diocese of Langres. These, as it is well said, were the eldest daughters of the house of Cîteaux. The younger establishments and their affiliated institutions are past reckoning here. The popularity of the Cistercian order arose from the greater severity of the life enjoined upon the monks, such as abstinence even from eggs and fish as well as flesh, except during sickness. But the practical diligence of the Benedictine body from its first formation made it more endurable. Of course with increased wealth indulgence found its way into these brotherhoods as into all others.

Simon Stock, the founder of the order of the Carmelites, was also an Englishman. Not to lay any stress on the vision in which he received a scapulary from the Virgin Mary, we may rest on the

fact that the Benedictine rule c. 55 recognises this article of dress, which was convenient for the defence of the upper part of the body from rain, heat, or cold. The Enc. Dic. describes it as one piece of cloth, of which one angle fell in front and the other behind. Many popes thought it so far worthy of notice, that they assigned special indulgences to those that wore it, so that at last there was an order of the scapulary or scapulars; and at last it merged into a little square of stuff with certain mystic marks worn on the shoulder. This is a reason for conjecturing that the original scapular of St Benedict may have been square with a hole for the head, like the Spanish poncho and some of our University robes. Nevertheless there are dissenters from this line of thought who maintain that the proper thing was two squares of cloth tied to each other. There was, it seems—or shall we say it seems to be said that there was?—a new vision on the subject as late as 1846: which also enjoys Papal sanction. Our subject leads us to shew something of the views of some of these innumerable and widely-spread fraternities upon the Lord's supper. Anchorites could seldom partake of it; but in brotherhoods containing many ordained persons there was no limit to the facility of its repetition.

P. 1399. "Let mass be celebrated on the fifth Sunday before the passover after prime with solemnity as on the birthday of one apostle, and without kneeling: and let all, as well the converted as the rest, communicate at the great altar, unless their great number shall make another arrangement necessary: but let the deacon put so many hosts to be consecrated, that the communion itself may be enough for all the brethren on that very day also, and that a part of the sacred communion may be able to be reserved as well for the office of the day following as for the sick. But after the utterance of 'peace be to you,' let the Lord's body be taken from the vessel on the altar, and be placed on the paten to be taken

---

*Usus Ordinis Cistert., Pars I. de Cæna Domini,  
Migne, C. XXI., p. 1399.*

Feriâ quintâ ante pascha missa celebretur post primam solemniter ut in natali unius apostoli, et sine flexione genuum, omnesque, tam conversi quam cæteri, ad magnum altare communicent, nisi aliter multitudo exegerit. Diaconus autem tot hostias consecrandas opponat, ut et ipsâ die fratribus omnibus ipsa communio sufficiat, et tam pro officio sequentis diei quam pro infirmis pars sacræ communionis reservari possit. Post pacem vero corpus Domini de vasculo super altare sumatur; et

at that hour. But let the linen cloth be presently taken from the same vessel and another, presented by the sacristan, be put in its place (lit. in the same place) at that hour: and when that has been changed by the same sacristan, let the abbot or him that sings the mass with honour put away the part of the sacred communion that is to be kept till to-morrow, in a vessel previously marked. And then let the old cloth, carefully shaken out in a paten, be burnt over the piscina, and its ashes thrown into it. ... On the preparation. Let them restore the cross to its own place on the altar. Then let the abbot and the deacon approach with bare feet... And when this has been done let the deacon put the corporal on the altar... But let the abbot, carrying down to the altar the Lord's body and the vessel in which it is, place it near the corporal, and when the deacon has made ready the cup with the wine mixed with water, let the abbot, after incense has been previously used, then wash his fingers in the open vessel and take the holy communion out of the vessel and put it on the corporal... Let him divide the Lord's body into three parts. Afterwards let the deacon, having made an incensing, wash his hands and stand with the subdeacon until he ought to approach to the altar to communicate." [Compare with Christ's simple ordinance Matt. xxvi.]

---

super patenam illâ horâ sumendum ponatur. Linteum autem mox de eodem vasculo auferatur, aliudque a sacristâ illâ horâ præsentatum in eodem ponatur; illoque mutato ab eodem secretario, mox abbas vel qui cantat missam partem sacræ communionis, in crastinum servandam in vasculo ante notato honorifice recondat. Et tunc linteum vetus, in patenâ diligenter excussum, super piscinam *comburatur*, *cineresque ejus* in eam *projiciantur*. C. XXII. De Parasceve. Crucem in suum super altare locum reponant. Tunc abbas et diaconus...nudis pedibus accedant... Quo facto diaconus corporale super altare ponat...abbas vero, corpus Dominicum cum vasculo in quo est ad altare deferens, juxta corporale ponat, et cum diaconus calicem cum vino aqua misto... ordinaverit, abbas incenso prius adhibito, deinde aperto vasculo digitos lavet et extractam de vasculo sanctam communionem super corporale ponat...Corpus Domini in tres partes dividat. Porro diaconus, factâ thurificatione, ablutis manibus cum subdiacono stet donec communicaturus accedere debeat ad altare.

(P.) BRUNO, BISHOP OF SIGNIA (SEGNÍ.) D. 1125.

His agnomen is Astensis, from Asti (perhaps *ἄστν*) in Italy, where he was born, 24 miles east of Turin, then of old as now the capital of a district. There are too many other Brunos to recite here. One of the same century as this Bruno is in high repute in

the Roman communion for having founded the order of Carthusian monks in the district of Chartreux near Grenoble. It is now disputed whether Bruno of Angers was on Berengar's side, but it is clear that he gave the highest preferment to Berengar.

Our Italian Bruno received his see from the hands of Gregory VII., but he retired after a while to Monte Cassino, and was drawn forth thence by the urgency of his fellow-prelates, who constrained him to reoccupy his chair with all its responsibilities. He is afterwards chiefly signalized by his strong opposition to the teaching of Berengar on the Lord's supper. (See a letter assigned to the second Bruno, Migne, Vol. 147.) Many of his works have been mingled also with those of the first Bruno mentioned above. The prolegomena to them in Migne's edition ascribes to our Bruno of Segni the overthrow of Berengar and his consequent temporary recantation when judged before the Roman council. It credits him also with having been sent in Divine Providence against the schism of Guibert of Ravenna, as well as against simony and the corruption of the clergy, and in favour of clerical and papal authority.

Vol. I. p. 1262, Cant. v. "I have drunk, &c." "Ye, apostles, are indeed the wine that being fully filled with the Divine cup, are possessed of all skill. But the milk stands for those that are furnished with moderate and imperfect knowledge. Christ therefore has come into His garden and carried home to Him with excessive love, the myrrh which the wind had blown around, that is to say the saints, whom the tyrant had made sad. Christ says to the apostles, 'Eat and drink ye, My friends.' The address is to the apostles, 'Ye are My friends, eat ye the doctrine of 'faith and My flesh; drink ye My blood (John vi. For except, &c.), Eat therefore the living bread, drink the cup of the

---

*Opera, Migne, c. LXIV. and c. LXV., p. 1262, Comm. in Cant. c. V.,*  
*"I have drunk my wine with my milk."*

Vinum quidem vos estis, apostoli, qui Divino calice inebriati omnem peritiam habetis. Lac vero illi sunt qui mediocri et imperfectâ scientiâ ornantur. Venit igitur Christus in hortum Suum, et myrrham, quam ventus perflaverat (sanctos scilicet quos tyrannus contristaverat) nimio Secum amore devexit. Christus ad apostolos dicit, "Comedite amici Mei et bibite." Apostropha ad apostolos, "Vos amici Mei estis, vos doctrinam fidei et carnem Meam comedite, vos sanguinem Meum bibite (John vi. 54, For except ye eat My flesh, &c.). Comedite

‘New Testament, and be filled to the full, my dearest friends.’ For he that is inebriated with this cup is inebriated with true knowledge. For he that despises riches, desires death, forgets himself, cares not for things seen, and believes in things not seen, does not he seem to be inebriate? [Perhaps the best exposition of this singular language.]

P. 299, Matt. xxvi. 26. “The Lord is explaining in this place what He meant when He said elsewhere, ‘Except ye eat, &c.’ Lo! the Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedec converts bread and wine by His ineffable power into the substance of His own body and blood. For as He was then both living and speaking, and yet was being eaten and drunk by the disciples, so now also He remains entire and incorruptible, and is eaten and drunk by His own believing disciples in the sacrament of bread and wine. For except the bread and wine were converted into His body and blood, He would never be corporeally eaten and drunken. For those things are changed into these; these are eaten and drunken in those; but in what mode this takes place, He Himself only knows, Who can do all things and knows all things. [Exactly the doctrine maintained by many in the English church since the Reformation.] For He said then by His own mouth; He says now too by His own ministers, ‘This is My body.’ And so great is the power and efficacy of His word, that what is said takes place immediately. But in like manner while He says ‘This is my blood,’ the wine is presently converted into His blood. ‘And He took, &c.’ This,

“igitur panem vivum, bibite calicem novi testamenti et inebriamini, charissimi.” Qui enim hoc calice inebriatur verâ scientiâ inebriatur. Qui enim divitias spernit, mortem desiderat, sui obliviscitur, negligit quæ videt, credit quæ non videt, nonne is ebrius esse videtur?

*Matt. XXVI. 26, p. 299.*

Exposuit Dominus hoc in loco quod significaret quum alibi diceret John vi. 54, “Except ye eat,” &c. Ecce sacerdos in æternum secundum ordinem Melchizedech panem et vinum virtute ineffabili in Sui corporis et sanguinis substantiam convertit. Sicut enim tunc et vivebat et loquebatur et tamen a discipulis comedebatur et bibebatur, ita et modo integer et incorruptibilis manet, et a fidelibus Suis in panis et vini sacramento quotidie bibitur et manducatur. Nisi enim panis et vinum in Ejus carnem et sanguinem verterentur, nunquam Ipse corporaliter manducaretur vel biberetur. Mutantur enim ista in illa: comeduntur et bibuntur illa in istis: quod qualiter fiat Ipse solus novit. Qui omnia potest et omnia novit. Dixit enim tunc per Se: dicit et modo per ministros Suos, “This is My body.” Et tanta est Ejus verbi virtus et efficacia, ut statim fit quod dicatur. Similiter autem dum dicit, “This is My blood,” mox in Ejus sanguinem vinum convertitur “And He took the cup and said,” &c. &c. Hic, inquit, sanguis Meus est,

He says, is My blood, which is to be shed, not this one, and that another, but that and this, one and the same. To-morrow therefore it shall be shed from My side, which ye are now drinking and seeing in the cup.

P. 291. "I will drink, &c." "The kingdom of God is the church, in which the old wine is not drunk, nor is the old doctrine taken up, because the Scripture is not understood to the letter but spiritually. In this (church) Christ drinks the new wine with us, since remaining with us He hungers and thirsts with us and is refreshed in our persons with food and drink. Matt. xxv. 35, &c.

P. 444. Luke xxiv. "He says, Much have I desired to eat this passover with you, that I might fulfil the old things and pass over to the new. 'Till it be fulfilled, &c.', i.e. till it be spiritually understood and done. 'At My table, &c.' But this can also be understood of that Heavenly table, at which the saints are refreshed *solely* with the contemplation of the greatest good." [Bruno appears to have caught something from Berengar's beautiful utterances. One would almost wish to think he had written "Summi Boni," the supreme and most good God.]

qui fundendus est, non alius iste et alius ille : sed unus idemque et iste et ille. Cras igitur fundetur ex hoc Meo latere, quem vos modo bibitis et videtis in calice.

P. 291. "*I will drink no more,*" &c.

Regnum Dei ecclesia est, in quâ vetus vinum non bibitur nec vetus doctrina suscipitur: quia non ad literam sed spiritualiter Scriptura intelligitur. In hac Christus vinum novum bibit nobiscum, quoniam nobiscum manens in nobis esurit et sitit, in nobis cibatur atque potatur. Matt. xxv. 35, &c. &c.

P. 444. *Luke XXIV.*

Multum, inquit, hoc pascha vobiscum manducare desideravi, ut vetera complerem et ad nova transirem. "Till it be fulfilled in God's 'kingdom,' i. e. donec in regno Dei spiritualiter intelligatur et agatur... "At My table in My kingdom."... Hoc autem et de illâ cœlesti mensâ intelligi potest, in quâ sancti solâ summi boni contemplatione reficiuntur.

## THE TWELFTH CENTURY.

(A.) PETER OF BLOIS, ARCHDEACON OF BATH AND OF LONDON.  
B. 1130. D. 1200.

HIS training is due to Bologna as well as Paris. It embraced many branches of human learning: but all gave way before theology when John of Salisbury became his instructor. At 36 he went to Sicily as tutor to a relative of the king; but the hatred felt there towards the French drove him out; and coming to England he was made Archdeacon of Bath at the request of Henry II., and Chancellor of Canterbury under Richard, being thus the successor of Thomas à Becket. After 26 years he visited France, but never struck root there; so that he returned to England and died on English ground. He was at one time in possession of the Archdeaconry of London: which they say was poorer though a far heavier office than that of Bath. He is praised for high integrity, as well as for practical talents. But his writings give us the man.

Of his verses I take but six, on the water and wine. There are in these no false quantities and but one anti-Priscian liberty. I will not versify, but give literal prose.

“Three mystic gifts are set on the Lord's table  
But after consecration only two are found.  
There is water mixed with the wine before, but afterward  
There is only blood, to feed our inward spirit.  
The water is for a mystic meaning, but Christ's blood  
absorbs it,  
For God translates the earth of our body into His own.”

---

Sed licet in mensâ Domini tria constituentur  
Munera, sunt tantum duo postquam sanctificantur.  
Est aqua mista prius vino; sed quando sacratur  
Nonnisi sanguis erit, quo spiritus intus alatur.  
Mystica res dat aquam. Christi cruor ebibit illam;  
Nam transfert nostram Deus in Sua membra favillam.



P. 613. "At the Lord's supper they make void Christ's passion and deride all the matter of our redemption who do not with the utmost humility and diligence consider with how great reverence Christ's flesh and blood ought to be made, and how devoutly handled, how holily received, and how carefully dispensed: Heb. ix. 'If the blood of bullocks, &c., &c.' But I have set this before you regarding the sacrament of the altar and the mass, because the institution of this sacrament was ministered to-day; to-day if I may so speak the mass was born. For this reason and as it were in the day of its birth, the mass is celebrated with more elegant worship and with a multitude and divers kinds of priests standing around, as it is written, Ps. cxvii. Make a solemn day with persons close together even to the horn of the altar, *i.e.* in the multitude of priests even to the virtue and efficacy of the sacrament... that He may receive at His table and communicate Himself to us in His own table, a viaticum (*i.e.* provision for the way) in this life, and in that which is to come the fulness of our desires, Christ Jesus, to Whom is honour and glory to ages of ages. Amen.

P. 859. "Against the Jews' perfidiousness, c. 27, on the sacrament of the altar. But life eternal is in the sacrament of the altar, so that it is impossible that those that worthily partake of it can die eternally. The bread and wine offered by Melchizedek, king and priest, were as it were sacraments (sacred signs) of this sacrament: and the sacrifice is celebrated in bread

*Opera, Migne, Vol. CCVII. p. 613, Sermo XIX.  
In Cœna Domini.*

Passionem Christi evacuant, totumque negotium nostræ redemptionis irident, qui cum summâ humilitate et diligentia non attendunt, cum quantâ reverentiâ caro et sanguis Christi debeat confici, quam devote tractari, quam sancte suscipi, quam industrie dispensari. Heb. ix. "If the blood," &c. Hæc vero de sacramento altaris et de missâ proposui quia hodie hujus sacramenti institutio facta est; hodie ut ita dicam missa nata est. Unde et quasi in die sui natalis missa elegantiore cultu et cum multitudine et diversitate sacerdotum circumstantium celebratur, sicut scriptum est, Constituite diem solennem in condensis usque ad cornu altaris, Ps. cxvii. id est in multitudine sacerdotum usque ad virtutem et efficaciam sacramenti... Qui nos ad mensam Suam recipiat et Seipsum nobis in mensa Suâ communicet in hac vitâ viaticum, et in futuro plenitudinem desideriorum, Christus Jesus, Cui est honor et gloria in sæcula sæculorum. Amen.

*Contra perfidiam Judæorum. C. XXVII. De Sac. Altaris, p. 859.*

In sacramento autem altaris est vita æterna, ut impossibile sit digne participantes æternaliter mori. Hujus sacramenti quasi sacramenta fuerunt panis et vinum a Melchisedech rege et sacerdote oblata; atque in pane et vino hoc sacrificium celebratur, Christo instituyente, &c.

and wine, Christ Himself instituting it thus, &c. But also this sacrament was figured in the sacrifice of Isaac and in the sacrifices of other just men; yet Melchizedek's oblation figured it more expressly. But if the Jew grunt in dissatisfaction at this, saying that Melchizedek offered the bread and wine to Abraham for his refreshment and not as a sacrifice to God, let him listen to the reading of Genesis, where after the oblation of the bread was made by Melchizedek, it is immediately subjoined, For he was the priest of the most high God. For he could have brought these things for refreshment, if he had not been a priest. But the priest's office is made plain in this, as it is a priest's office to sacrifice to bless and to receive tithes. The law figured the sacrament in bread and in the lamb and in the manna. But bread springs from the earth according to that saying, Ps. ciii., 'That thou mayest bring bread out of the earth:' and Ps. lxxxiv., 'The Truth, Christ, sprang from the earth.' Christ as the Lamb was sacrificed, Isaiah liii., 'He was led as a lamb to the slaughter.' The manna came down from the heaven. And Christ says, John xvi., 'I came down from the Father and have come into the world.'"

Licet hoc autem sacramentum fuerit in sacrificio Isaac figuratum, aliorumque justorum sacrificiis, oblatio tamen Melchizedech expressius figuravit. Quod si Judeus obgrunniat dicens Melchizedech dedisse panem et vinum Abrahæ in refectionem illius, non ut Deo sacrificium offerret, audiat Genesis lectionem, ubi post oblationem panis a Melchisedech factam, statim subjungitur, Erat enim sacerdos Dei altissimi. Hæc enim in refectionem ferre potuisset, si sacerdos non esset. Sed in eo sacerdotis officium declaratur, cujus est sacrificare, benedicere, decimas accipere. Figuravit lex sacramentum in pane et agno et mannâ. Panis autem de terrâ nascitur juxta illud Ps. ciii., Ut educas panem de terra: et Ps. lxxxiv., Veritas, Christus, de terra orta est. Agnus immolatus est Christus, Is. liii., Sicut agnus ad occisionem ductus est. Manna de cælo descendit. Et Christus dicit, Joh. xvi. Descendi a Patre et veni in mundum.

(B.) GUIBERT, ABBOT OF ST MARY OF NOGENT EN COUCL.  
ABBOT 1104. D. 1124.

Besides the treatise on the sop given to Judas and on the truth of the Lord's body, Guibert wrote other treatises and commentaries. He is also notable for eight books on the Divine exploits by means of the French, to which we owe a description of the person of Peter the Hermit. He also gives us an autobiography in three books. He was brought up under our own Anselm, when he was Abbot of

Bec in Normandy, and dedicates his history of the Crusade to the Bishop of Soissons. The subjects of three other of his treatises are (1) The praise of the Virgin, who he says is the door of the temple in Ezekiel that opened toward the east, (2) Virginity, and (3) Relics, *pignora sanctorum*, which was written to bring to reason his neighbours the monks of the convent of St Medard, who annoyed him by continually magnifying a very precious relic, which they said they possessed, a real tooth of Jesus our Saviour: which we shall see leads him to speak there also of the Lord's supper.

These extracts are preceded by a notice that they are against Berengar. Certainly Anselm had no reason to be ashamed of his pupil: nor was Guibert a feeble coverer of Anselm's side in the contest. His Latin too is better than most. True, many of his arguments, founded on the Communion Service in use at that day, require no answer from members of the Church of England, whose form of service has no similar expressions: and the inference *à fortiori* from the effect of Baptism in giving forgiveness of sins, falls equally harmless on those churches which do not even hold that original sin is removed by baptism. And moreover the answer to the question why we make more of this than of other types and shadows of Christ, is that Christ gave to this a signal and eminent honour and glory. But all this it may have without our believing that "the something special in it" amounts to the bread and the wine being Christ's true natural body. This our church denies.

In all these extracts from the treatise on relics Guibert seems to me to be throughout at the very boundary of reason on this side or the other. And the reply is that as we believe the humanity of Christ to be true and real, so we conclude that this body of flesh and blood was as much like ours, as ours is like Adam's when he was created. To say then that it was not in itself mortal or capable of suffering, and to attribute Christ's capability of suffering and dying simply to His will, is to be far wiser than Holy Writ, and is to be in danger of falling unawares into folly and heresy at once. Yet the Scriptures involve such strong reasons for Christ's body not being present in the Lord's supper, that the only chance for a combatant on the opposite side is to practise the feint of Guibert in this treatise, "*caput inter nubila cōdere.*"

P. 528. "On the sop given to Judas and on the truth of the Lord's body. First it is even a matter of horror, if I may say anything on which I may seem to be contradicting the opinion of the fathers. [As if all the fathers had on every point one opinion, and as if it were a horrible sin to hold a different opinion.] I ask therefore that if I should yet have said anything beyond the rule [of faith], thou wouldst hear them as in the intention with which I shall speak them... But Luke gives the weight of his name to the delivery of our Lord's body (*i.e.* into the hands of Judas). The author of the letter says that it stands forth as a sign and not as the truth [of Christ's body]... If it is a shadow of it and not the body we are falling down first to one shadow and then to another... If that is true, which is delivered by the old authors—than which nothing is more true—original sin was forgiven before circumcision through sacrifices. But as to this victim (host) of ours, the Lord having suffered once for all, if it (this sacrament) be a figure only of Him Who suffered, I know not whether it has any true efficiency. But if it be only a commemoration of His death, like some representation of God or of some saint or other such as is wont to be painted in the churches, it is but perfunctory, [*i.e.* going through a rite without any special inherent power in it]. That therefore which it shews is a memorial to the common people's eyes, and supplies little or no assistance to the wise. But I would wish to know why the cup of blood is called that of the new and eternal testament. Where any innovation is made antiquity is abrogated. If antiquity is in fault and novelty is in favour, grace itself is none at all unless its influence extends to eternity. But it gives a kind of witness and promise of

*Migne, p. 528.*

De bucellâ Judæ datâ, et de veritate Dominici corporis. Primo etiam horri mihi est, si aliqua dicam in quibus videar Patrum sententiæ refragari. Unde peto, ut si quæ tamen præter regulam dixerò, ea audias intentione quâ dicam. [P. 530.] Lucas vero corporis Dominici traditioni (sc. in Judæ manus) subscribit... Epistolæ auctor dicit quod signum et non veritas extet... Si umbra est et non corpus, in umbram de umbrâ decidimus... Si verum est quod ab auctoribus traditur—quo nihil verius—ante circumcisionem originale peccatum sacrificiis solvebatur. Hæc autem hostia nostra, passo semel Domino, si sola Passi figura (ut dicitur) sit, si quid veri efficiat nescio. Quod si sola mortis Illius memoria est, quasi aliqua aut Dei aut sancti cujuspiam, quæ in ecclesiis pingi solet, imago, perfunctoria est. Quod ergo solum præfert, rudium oculis monumentum parvum aut nullum præstat sapientibus adjumentum. Sed scire velim quare calix sanguinis novi et æterni testamenti dicitur (Matt. xxvi. 28, Mk. xiv. 24, Lu. xxii. 20). Ubi quid innovatur, vetustas abrogatur (Heb. viii. 13). Vetustas in peccato si est, et novitas in gratiâ, gratia ipsa nulla est nisi ad æternitatem possit.

eternity. It is therefore the efficient cause of certain good, and not empty or merely shadowy [*i.e.* figurative]. For which reason also in the rule of consecrating, the same cup is called a mystery of faith ... Each therefore [the bread and the wine] is a mystery ... What then does the additional idea 'of faith' mean? It plainly is as if one were to say, The secret essence of the whole of the faith, in which that is to say the greatness of all our believing is hid. For which reason also they say what follows, 'The cup of blood itself conveys in itself a fruit nothing less than Divine; that is to say, remission of sins. Let (the others) then say what shadow (figure) there is which brings forth so great truth. I wonder also with what ears they hear the words of the Truth Himself, John vi. 56, where there truly is something, 'He that eateth My flesh and drinketh, &c.' How is it only an appearance or only a shadow? And certainly if after the priest's prayer the appearance of bread were quite changed into flesh, contention would be laid to rest ... But if it is an appearance, and has nothing more (real) than the rock, which according to the apostle is Christ, I wonder why we do not pay (lit. follow with) to rocks, trees, and other things, which in the Scriptures are said to signify Christ, the same tribute of attention and praise that we pay to the small portion of bread and wine which is made on the altar. Why not call them 'blessed, &c.' and again 'pure, holy and immaculate,' also founts of 'eternal life,' or 'of everlasting salvation'? [All this is but an appeal to the church's received opinions and not to truth itself, or to the Bible.] And lastly, after 'they will be borne home to the 'lofty altar of God by angel's hands at the priest's prayer,' which refers to nothing else than Christ's body, &c.? Why call we not

---

*Æternum autem quiddam testatur et spondet. Magni igitur ejusdam boni effectiva, et non inanis aut umbratica est... Unde et in consecrativo canone calix isdem mysterium fidei appellatur... Est ergo utrumque mysterium... Quid itaque sibi vult adjectivum fidei? Est plane ac si diceret, Arcanum totius fidei, in quo scilicet universæ nostræ credulitatis majestas latet. Unde et sequentia dicunt, Ipse calix sanguinis fructum in se portat nonnisi Divinum—remissionis videlicet peccatorum. Dicant ergo quænam umbra est, quæ tantam parturit veritatem. Miror quoque quibus auribus audiant Ipsius Veritatis verba, John vi. 56, ubi vere quidpiam est. Sola species aut sola umbra quomodo est? Et certe si post orationem sacerdotis species panis demutaretur in carnem, contentio sopiretur... Quod si species est, et nihil habet amplius quam petra, quæ secundum apostolum Christus est, miror quare petras ligna et cætera, quæ Christum in Scripturis significare dicuntur, non eâ aspectione eâ laude prosequimur quâ illam hostiolam panis ac vini, quæ in altare conficitur! Quare non ea "benedicta," &c.; et rursum "pura sancta immaculata:" "vitæ quoque æternæ," aut "salutis perpetuæ." Et ultimum, postquam "in sublime Dei altare per manus "angeli sacerdotis precatione deferentur," quod non est aliud quam*

them again the sanctified, vivified and blessed (elements of the living Lord) ?

P. 532. "And alas for the sluggishness of our minds ! so much force is allowed to the element of baptism by the invocation of the blessed Trinity, that simple water is made fruitful and quickened to wash our sins, and to this sacrament, which is made by God's own word, only a stupid figurative meaning is assigned.

P. 609. *Of the saints' pledges.* "Where the speaking concerning the Lord's body has come on, then all that we had begun to say regarding the Giver has fallen through.

P. 631. "Will there then be two bodies set forth to inculcate this remembrance ? John xii. 8, 'Me ye will not always have'; Matt. xxviii. 20, 'But I am with you always,' &c. We must without doubt know that the latter is to be understood of defending us in spiritual things, since He is God : but the former of His bodily presence ... For His saying 'Me' embraces whatever His manhood ever was ...

P. 634. "It is asked whether that body which is received from the altar wears the appearance of a living or of a dead Lord. [See the Rev. Canon Vogan] ... But in person He is God and man. What reasoning will allow God and man to be capable of being eaten ? For it is (assumed) in that word 'He that eateth

Christi corpus, &c. ? Quare non iterum "sanctificata vivificata" ac "benedicta" vocamus ?

P. 532.

Et, O vecordia ! elemento haptismatis per Trinitatis invocationem tantum defertur ut simplices aquæ ad peccata eluenda sæcundentur et vivificentur, et huic sacramento, quod Dei proprio verbo conficitur, sola stolidi figura tribuitur.

*De pignoribus sanctorum, p. 609.*

Ubi de Domini corpore sermo incidit, totum etiam tunc, quod loqui super Dante cœperamus, excidit.

P. 631.

Duo ergo erunt corpora nobis ad hanc memoriam inculcandam præstituta ? John xii. 8, Me non semper habebitis ; Matt. xxviii. 20, Ego autem vobiscum semper, &c. Sciendum procul dubio quia hoc intelligendum est de tutelâ, in quantum Deus est, spirituali : illud de præsentia corporali... Quod enim dicit, "Me," quidquid humanitas unquam fuit, complectitur.

P. 634.

Quæritur utrum corpus illud, quod ab altari sumitur, speciem viventis Domini vel mortui gerat... Personaliter autem Dens ac homo est. Deum ergo et hominem maudibilem fieri quæ permittet ratio ? In

'Me.' John vi. 58. It seems that it must be so understood. [Rather a ground for not so believing it.]

P. 640. "Shall we then say that the teeth of worthless little creatures happen to eat that which Christian leaders, with such feeling and so many tears in the midst of their pious flocks, sacrifice, though indeed it is Christ that is High-priest in it? ...

P. 646. "There is therefore nothing whatever mortal or passible in Christ: nothing at all would you find in Him but the incorruptible and immortal, except that He wished to die. [The last few words overthrow all his argument, for if His body could die it was not immortal.]

P. 648. "But they resolve that it ought in no other way to be understood than that it ought to be received in that property of it in which it was when He was setting forth the same body to the disciples to be eaten. *Answer.* No difference can be made between a living and a dead body... His power makes Him omnipotent for either... Our Lord wished to lead us from His principal body to His mystical [which Guibert held to be a real material body also], and starting thence to educate us as it were by certain steps to an understanding of the subtle nature of the Divine."

eo enim verbo quo dicitur, "Qui manducat Me" John vi. 50, sic necessario intelligi debere videtur.

P. 640.

Dicemus ergo quod vilium bestiarum dentes fortuitu molant, quod tantis affectibus totque cum lacrimis Christiani præsules, cum piis gregibus, Christo tamen præpontificante, immolant?

P. 646.

Non est igitur mortale aut passibile in Christo quidpiam... nihil omnino nisi incorruptibile et immortale, nisi quod mori voluit, in Ipso reperias.

P. 648.

Aliter autem nequiquam intelligi debere perpendunt, nisi ut in eâ qualitate accipi debeat in quâ, cum corpus idem manducandum discipulis proponerat, erat, &c. (*Answer*) Nil inter viventem et mortuum discerni potest... Omnipotentem efficacia reddit... A principali corpore ad mysticum Dominus noster nos voluit traducere, et exinde quasi quibusdam gradibus ad Divinæ subtilitatis intelligentiam erudire.

## (C.) HERVÉ, THE MONK OF BOURG DIEU. MONK ABOUT 1100.

He was a native of Mans, and must not be confounded with the Dominican Hervé of Brittany, of the 14th century, who wrote on the book of Peter Lombard. The monk of Bourg Dieu in Berri was a great student of the Bible and of the fathers of the early centuries, particularly of Augustine, whose writings he uses, like many more, as if they were his own. The commentary which he wrote on Isaiah in eight books is followed by a similar handling of all St Paul's Epistles, except the brief letter to Philemon. These survive, and long had the honour of being printed with the works of Anselm. But he wrote on many other parts of the sacred volume. The fast before Easter had something to do with his death. It is said that he compiled an account of the miracles that were wrought in his town by the influence of the Virgin, and that he would have written on a work then attributed to Cyprian on the Lord's supper had he lived longer. His town has the name of Bourg Deols (qy. Dole), so that he acquires the title Burgidolensis.

P. 935. Commentary on 1 Corinthians xi. "Eating unworthily." "Since we have proved by the authority of the Lord Jesus that that bread is His body and the wine His blood, and that that mystery is to be celebrated or to be received in commemoration of the death of (Christ) Himself, therefore whatever man, be he rich or in middle life or poor, be he clerical or lay, shall have eaten this bread of the Lord and have drunk the cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty, &c. He eats and drinks unworthily who celebrates or who receives this mystery otherwise than it was handed down by Christ. Therefore he becomes guilty, &c. He will suffer the penalties (appertaining to) the Lord's death, &c.

---

*Com. in 1 Cor. XI. P. 935. On eating unworthily, &c.*

Quandoquidem auctoritate Domini Jesu probavimus panem illum esse corpus Ejus et vinum sanguinem Ejus, atque celebrandum vel accipiendum esse mysterium illud in commemorationem mortis Ipsius, itaque quicumque homo, sive dives sive mediocris sive pauper, sive clericus sive laicus, manducaverit panem Domini hunc et biberit calicem Domini indigne reus, &c. Indigne manducat et bibit, qui mysterium hoc aliter celebrat vel accipit quam a Christo traditum. [See Cyprian, Ep. LXIII.] Ideo fit reus, &c., i.e. dabit pœnas mortis Domini, &c. &c.



P. 938. 1 Cor. xi., last v. "He first shewed how a man and how a woman ought to manage regarding the head; next in what way each sex must meet in church, &c. But the other things [Gk. *τὰ λοιπὰ*], that pertain to the church's edification, he promised that he would set in order when he was present, because it would be a long matter to direct them in the whole order of action, which the whole church through the world observes, in his letter."

---

P. 938. 1 Cor. XI. "*The rest will I set in order when I come.*"

Prius ostendit quomodo vir et quomodo fœmina caput agere debeat; deinde qualiter ab utroque sexu in ecclesiam convenire oporteat, &c. Cætera vero, quæ ad ædificationem ecclesiæ pertinent, præsentia suâ ordinaturum se promisit, quia multum erat ut in epistolâ suâ totum illis agendi ordinem insinaret, quem universa per orbem servat ecclesia.

(D.) HUGUES DE S. VICTOR, OR DE PARIS. B. 1048. D. 1141.

*Canon of the St Augustine Convent, so-called.*

If Anselm had not won the position of a second St Augustine we might more patiently listen to the reason for honouring this Hugo with that title. But he seems to have less of the dialectic element than Anselm or than Abailard, with whose opinions he contends. He was a native of Ypres in Holland, and in 1118 was admitted on the foundation of the Parisian School of St Victor, founded by the Realist William of Champeaux after his defeat by Abailard.

One may protest against inward and personal religion being nicknamed "mysticism"; but if all its professors had been as sober and sound as Hugo de St Victor in the cultivation of subjective religious experience, it would have little merited that opprobrious brand. One of his chief works is on the sacraments. Gieseler judges that in this school scholasticism and mysticism were united; the former to contribute light, the latter warmth and practicality. Richard and Walter both also bear the title de St Victor: the former was a true follower, the latter an extravagant assailant, of the schoolmen.

He was a close friend of St Bernard, and had much correspondence with that notable man, who dedicates to Hugo his treatise on

**Baptism.** He is reckoned superior in knowledge to all scholastic writers before him, and to all of his own time. In his views were united reason and revelation, faith and science, speculation and practice, intelligence and the heart, nature and grace. Thus the panegyric runs; and his treatise on the sacraments is said to comprise the whole of theology. Cramer (Leipsic, A.D. 1785), cited in the book referred to, says, "If ever a work merited the name of a "system it is that," &c., &c., concluding thus: "In following Hugo "we do not find ourselves in regions whose splendour and magnificence blind and lead astray, nor in an arid desert that fatigues "and kills, but in an agreeable and fertile open country, that "refreshes and reanimates (*récrée et ranime*)."

P. 824. "Of the many ways of receiving the eucharist. Let Him who has once been given to the world in the form of flesh, be given at all days and at all hours to the faithful in the form of bread, *i.e.* in that real thing in His own sacrament; but He is given more frequently and at all hours to the faithful in tasting His Spirit: first unto redemption—secondly unto sanctification—thirdly unto consolation. The first requires that there be right faith; the second that the conscience be pure; the third that there be devoutness pure and ready. This raises the mind up to meet grace: opens the heart to receive it: expands the affection, that from this he may receive more.

P. 530. "Questions on the epistles of Paul. 1 Corinthians. Why has He given this sacrament under another appearance and not under its own? Solution. That that which concerns unseen things may have its merit [in seeing it] ... and that the eye may

*De multiplici acceptione Eucharistiæ. Opera, Migne, Vol. III. p. 824.*

Qui semel datus est mundo in forma carnis Is cunctis diebus aut horis detur fidelibus in specie panis, scilicet in eâ re sacramenti Sui; sed sæpius et in cunctis horis devotis datur in gustu Spiritus Sui: primum ad redemptionem—secundum ad sanctificationem—tertium ad consolationem. Primum exigit ut fides sit recta: secundum ut conscientia sit pura; tertium ut devotio sit pura et (in) promptu. Hoc mentem elevat ut gratiæ occurrat; cor aperit ut recipiat; affectum dilatat ut plurimum inde plus capiat.

1 Cor. XI. Vol. I. p. 530.

*Quæstiones in epistolas Pauli.*

Cur sub aliâ specie et non sub propriâ hoc sacramentum dederit? Solutio. Ut fides haberet meritum, quæ est de invisibilibus...et ne

not be revolted by that which the hand holds, and that it may not receive insult from those of us that do not believe. For He assumed body on account of the body, soul on account of the soul; and the bread is changed into flesh and the wine into blood. Whether the sacrament be made void, if water be omitted? It will not seem so to be, unless [the officiant] intentionally omitted it. The wicked truly receive both.

P. 139. "Concerning the sacred thing of the altar. Let it *par excellence* be called the eucharist, *i.e.* good grace. Not only is grace required, but He from Whom is all grace... When therefore we confess that the same body which hung on the cross and lay in the tomb is without doubt on the altar; and is as much here as it also was there, and now is at the right hand of the Father, it is not a matter of doubt that the same body of Christ on His own altar is not without a form, but is there invisibly, hid invisibly on the altar under another form.

P. 144. "For we cannot say that they (that appearance and taste) are in the substance of bread and wine, since there is not there the substance of bread and wine, but Christ's true body, nor dare we say they are in the body of Christ." [A new difficulty.]

abhorreret oculus *quod tenet manus*, et ne ab incredulis nobis insultaretur. Corpus enim propter corpus, animam propter animam assumpsit, et panis in carnem, vinum in sanguinem mutatur... An irritum fiat sacrificium si aqua prætermittatur? non videbitur, si non intendens præterivit... Malus utrumque vere sumit.

*Sum. Tract. c. II. De sancto altaris, Vol. II. p. 139.*

Per excellentiam dicatur eucharistia; *i.e.* bona gratia. Non solum gratia, sed Ille, a Quo est omnis gratia, sumitur... Cum enim idem corpus quod in cruce pependit, et in sepulchro jacuit, indubitanter fateamur esse in altari; et tantum hic quantum et ibi fuit, et modo est ad dexteram Patris, non est dubium ipsum Corpus Christi in altare Suo non carere formâ, sed ibi invisibiliter, in altari invisibiliter latens sub formâ alienâ.

P. 144.

Non enim possumus dicere quod sint (species et sapor ille) in substantiâ panis et vini, cum non sit ibi substantia panis et vini, sed verum corpus Christi, nec audemus dicere quod insint corpori Christi.

(E.) GRATIAN'S DECREE. A.D. 1143.

The practice of the Western church in relation to the Lord's supper, as in relation to everything else, was greatly influenced by the putting forth of that compilation of acts of councils and docu-

ments of all kinds, old and new, false and true, which appeared under the title, *Decretum Gratiani*, in the pontificate of Alexander III. That pope's authority I suppose gave it the name of a decree. Gratian was a monk of the convent of St Felix at Bologna, and in ecclesiastical law was without a rival. His eminence may be inferred from his having been sent by the Pope to England, as the chief of two nuncios, to compose the violent strife between our Henry II. and the pertinacious and powerful primate Thomas à Becket. Gratian's own title to his work is a *Textbook and Manual, Concordia Discordantium Canonum*. Hase in his *History of the Christian Church* says, p. 212 (London, 1855), that Gratian incorporated all laws then in force, extracting others from all sources. Gieseler, V. III. p. 156 (Edinb. 1853), refers to the way in which bodies of church law had been from time to time compiled; viz. by adding canons from past ages selected at pleasure to the decretals already existing: so Gratian merely took a wider sweep, and endeavoured to establish church jurisprudence on a broader basis in conformity with the wishes and judgments of the papal court. The *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals* had been constructed with this view and in this way: and the process had been continued by various leaders in different lands, and thus from time to time some additional revision and incorporation had become necessary; and in proportion to the skill with which it was done the compilation grew into general adoption, and the interval before another revision was longer. Gratian's work itself was supplemented in 1234, after a period of more than a century, by the five books of Pope Gregory IX.: and to them was added a sixth book in 1298 by Pope Boniface VIII. Then came the new *Clementines* (also five books) by Pope Clement V. in 1305, and the *Extravagantes*, additions of Pope John XXII. Others followed; and the series was brought to comparative completion in 1591 by Pope Paul IV.'s *Institutiones Juris Canonici*. In 1580 the whole mass is dedicated to Pope Gregory XIII. under the title of *Corpus Juris Canonici* by Paul Lancelot of Perugia. Such is the structure of Roman canon law, which may be compared to a mountain of conglomerate, with pebbles of every age and land. If not a few are found in this mass that are of pseudomorphous structure we must remember that the temptation to falsify was great, and the morals of many ages were low. What wonder if the Chancery of Christendom held out large rewards to those who could arrange and

digest ancient documents to the bent of the ecclesiastical rulers, and could supply any inconvenient chasms by new material that would work in well with the old? It may be that such ecclesiastical legislation was only one among many wicked practices prevalent from age to age; and if, as history and revelation seem to shew, this system of church management bore the bell among all wickednesses of those times by the superior heinousness of its craft and by the irresistibility of its oppression and corruption, this was nothing more than a noteworthy fulfilment of the accepted law of moral history, "corruptio optimi est pessima."

The English nation in its form of a Christian church may well thank God that she is delivered, by the statutes on which the English Reformation rests, from the whole body of the canon law of the Roman communion. If it be true that scarce any history is more painful to peruse than that on which Dean Milman has stamped the title of Latin Christianity, it may also be affirmed that no other history approaches to it in real utility to the English layman and the English clergyman of the present time.

(F.) HILDEBERT OF VENDOME, ABBOT OF CLUNY. B. 1158.

He was first taught by Berengar and then by the great Hugo or Hugh of Paris. He was made Bishop of Mans at 40 years of age, and then Archbishop of Tours in 1125. He wrote sermons and poetry, and his lives of Rhadegund and of St Hugh, Abbot of Cluny, and many of his letters remain. His works were published in 1708. Like Anselm he supported the Pope on investitures.

P. 223, n. "As often as (the priest) shall give the sacred body itself to each person, he first dips it in the wine.

III. 28. "In the meantime care is taken that the mouth [lit. cheek] of the sick man who is to receive the Lord's body be washed, and he receives it dipped in wine.

---

*Hildebert, 223 n. Udalric, II. 30.*

Quotquot ipsum sacrum corpus (sacerdos) dederit (in missâ) singulis, in sanguine prius intingit.

*III. 28.*

Interea curatur ut infirmi bucca lavetur, receptivi corpus Domini, quod recipit vino intinctum.

P. 1154. "Christ's body ... for although it is everywhere perceptible in itself, yet on the altar it exists in its own appearance [kind] not to be perceived ... perceivable on account of the form of the sacrament that is subjected to the senses, imperceptible as far as it relates to its appearance [kind] and the perception of our sense."

---

P. 1154.

Corpus Christi...quamvis enim ubique in seipso sit sensibile, tamen in altari juxta speciem suam existit, insensibile...sensibiliter propter sacramenti formam sensibus subjectam, insensibiliter quantum ad speciem et sensus nostri perceptionem.

(G.) HONORIUS. WROTE BETWEEN 1112 AND 1137.

He wrote on philosophy and ritual as well as on Scripture and theology.

*The Gem of the Soul.* P. 593. "On the water and the wine. Also by the wine the Deity is understood, by the water the manhood. These two are mingled together, while our manhood is by the blood of Christ joined to the Divinity. A cross is thrice made with salt and ashes over the water, because by the cross Christ impressed on men belief in the Trinity. Farther, the church's sacrifice is expressed by each of these three, which sacrifice is offered in this dedicated house. By salt and ashes the body of Christ is prefigured in His Divinity; by wine and water Christ's blood is marked beforehand, which is made (of wine) with water.

P. 595. "On incense. Then the pontiff [bishop] makes (the sign of) the cross with incense upon the altar, and bows himself to prayer. Christ also the Pontiff of pontiffs puts incense on the

---

*Gemma Animæ, Lib. I. p. 150, De vino et aquâ, p. 593.  
Opera, Migne.*

Item per vinum Divinitas, per aquam intelligitur humanitas. Hæc duo commiscuntur dum nostra humanitas per sanguinem Christi Divinitati adjungitur. Ter crux cum sale et cinere super aquam fit, quia per crucem Christus hominibus fidem Trinitatis impressit. Porro per hæc singula sacrificium ecclesiæ exprimitur quod in hac domo dedicatâ offertur : per salem et cinerem Christi corpus in Divinitate præfiguratur; per vinum et aquam Christi sanguis, quod cum aquâ conficitur, prænotatur.

P. 595. C. CLXIV, *De incenso.*

Tunc pontifex crucem incensi super altare facit, et se ad orationem submittit. Christus quoque Pontifex pontificum incensum crucis super

altar of the cross [or the incense of the cross upon the altar] because He intercedes with the Father for us. For to make a cross of incense is to shew to the Father His own passion on the church's behalf, and to intercede on our behalf, &c.

C. 166. "On relics of the saints. Their relics are sealed in the altar, because their souls are set in heavenly places.

C. 167. "Afterwards the altar is draped, because the souls in the resurrection are clothed with bodies, &c.

C. 165. "The pontiff coming before the altar, where the relics are hidden, extends a veil between himself and the people, because the places where the souls are, are secret from mortal vision.

C. 169. "On a set place and the sacrifice. Therefore as the mass is duly celebrated in a dedicated church, so in the catholic church is sacrifice legitimately offered, and outside it no sacrifice is accepted by God.

C. 160. "On the altar and cross. Afterwards the priest dips his finger and makes the cross on the four horns of the altar. The altar here expresses the primitive church (temple) in Jerusalem, as if Christ the Pontiff made the cross upon the altar, while He endured the cross in Jerusalem for the church. He marked the altar's four horns, while He saved by the cross the world's four

altare ponit, quia apud Patrem pro nobis intervenit. Crucem namque incensi facere est passionem Suam pro ecclesiâ Patri ostendere et pro nobis interpellare, &c.

*C. CLXVI, De reliquiis sanctorum.*

Reliquiæ in altari sigillantur, quia animæ in cælestibus collocantur.

*C. CLXVII.*

Post hæc altare vestitur, quia animæ in resurrectione corporibus vestiuntur, &c.

*C. CLXV.*

Veniens pontifex ante altare ubi reliquiæ sunt reconditæ, extendit velum inter se et populum, quia loca animarum secreta sunt a visione mortalium.

*C. CLXIX. De certo loco et sacrificio.*

Igitur sicut in ecclesiâ dedicatâ rite missa celebratur, sic in ecclesiâ catholicâ legitime sacrificatur et extra hanc nullum sacrificium a Deo acceptatur.

*C. CLX. De altari et cruce.*

Post hæc sacerdos digitum tingit et crucem per quatuor altaris cornua facit. Altare hic primitivam ecclesiam in Hierusalem exprimit, quasi Christus crucem Pontifex super altare fecit, dum crucem in Hierusalem pro ecclesia subiit. Quatuor cornua altaris signavit, dum quatuor partes mundi cruce salvavit. Deinde septies contra altare

parts. Next he sprinkles opposite the altar seven times, because Christ after the resurrection ordered that the church should be baptized in the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit. Next he goes round the altar in the sprinkling, &c. The altar is thrice sprinkled, &c. Then he goes through the whole church, &c."

---

*spargit, quia Christus post resurrectionem in septem donis Spiritus Sancti ecclesiam baptizari jussit...Deinde altare spargendo circuit, &c. Altare ter aspergitur, &c. Deinde per totam ecclesiam vadit, &c.*

(H.) PIERRE ABAILARD (ABELARD) OF BRETAGNE. Died at  
Chalons-sur-Saone. B. 1079. D. 1142.

The first success of Abailard in the lectures he delivered at his Paraclete school near Troyes, was the making an indelible impression on the mind of one young man in the crowd. So unknown and unnoticed was Arnold of Brescia, that the fact of his having been there has been denied. But Rome long felt Arnold's influence, who committed himself with most serious earnestness to proclaiming the absolute necessity of a thorough reform of the church system and a re-arrangement of its relations to the secular power throughout Christendom. He came to Rome in the time of Celestin II. and waked a spirit which gave many of the succeeding popes no small trouble to keep it down. Based on deep religious convictions, his movement lived long after he was removed from the turbulent and corrupt city. There was, as may be imagined, a vein of desire for church reform in Abelard's teaching also, which made for him many enemies. Of his long and at last unsuccessful struggle it is perhaps enough to say that the moral and high-minded Bernard loses somewhat of his dignity and character in it. He triumphed by an appeal to church prejudices, so that a considerable part of our sympathy in the conflict rests with the independent and undefended and almost unaided Abailard. We try to forget the stains of his early life and his merited punishment, and to receive him as a new and separate being in his contention for truth and freedom. And yet he never seems to have been comparable to Bernard as to the attainment of personal religion. But he grappled so boldly with many departments of error—with materialist infidelity, as well as with some of the prevailing superstitions in the church—that one may fancy that



his name will one day fly from mouth to mouth again in the battles that are yet to be fought between faith and unbelief. But Bernard and he moved on different lines: the former was an apostle of religious feeling, both as the superstitious crusader and as the rapt advocate of the kingdom of grace; the latter pushed onward the growing successes of young dialecticism. "Sic et non" is one of his most famous works. The Lord's supper he seems to have shrunk from debating at any length, as feeling it too sacred a subject for him.

He was born in 1079 at Palais near Nantes, of a noble family. He thought little of his rights, as eldest son, in his eagerness to pursue philosophical enquiry. His first exploit was to disenthroned William of Champeaux, the archdeacon of Notre Dame, in the new schools at Paris; where he was reigning supreme in the dialectic art. In the significant language of a writer upon the subject, the other masters found themselves without scholars. Abelard was also the idol of society. He fell fearfully, and was glad to hide his disgrace as a monk in the abbey of St Denys. In time he gave way to earnest solicitations and re-opened a school which was, as before, over-crowded. But it drew on him a flood of jealousy, and the attack began with a movement against his treatise on the Trinity, and it was condemned in the council of Soissons. Then Bernard wrote to the Pope against Abelard and Arnold of Brescia, as conspirators against Jesus Christ; and thus the struggle grew, and the schism widened, and by skilful tactics Abelard sank at last oppressed and denounced, so that only posterity could restore his fame. He died at Chalons-sur-Saone, and Heloise obtained leave to inter him where he gave his first lectures.

P. 1740. "On the sacrament of the altar. The cause of this sacrament is the remembrance of Christ's death and passion. For from the remembrance of our friends a love of them is wont to arise in a great degree. He therefore instituted this sacrament

---

*Epitome Theologiæ Christianæ.*

*III. 29. P. 1740. De Sacramento altaris. Op. Migne.*

Hujus sacramenti causa est memoria mortis et passionis Christi... Luc. xxii. 19. Ex memoriâ enim amicorum nostrorum multum solet in nobis dilectio eorum. Ad majorem igitur Sui dilectionem habendam hoc sacrificium

in memory of Himself to produce greater love of Himself. For in the sacrament we ought to have Christ thus before our eyes, as it were led to His passion, suffering and crucified for us; and this representation of that love makes us mindful of Him, Whom He Himself thus exhibited to us. Whence also it is that we are enkindled both with greater love and to suffer for His sake; which mutual love joins both Him to us and us to Him... It is to be noted that that bread before consecration is bread, and the wine in a similar way is wine. But after consecration both the bread is Christ's body, and the wine His blood. It is therefore the true body of Christ, yea Christ Himself. This body is the sacrament of that body of Christ which is the church. But the sacrament of His blood is the Spirit of the church [the Holy Spirit], Who by His seven-formed grace vivifies [the church] and works in it... Concerning the water we do not read that Christ had added it to this sacrament. Concerning that breaking of Him which there appears to take place, it is usually matter of doubt whether Christ's body, as it truly is there, be in truth broken. But we say that as it appears to be bread and is not... so it appears to be broken, when it suffers no breaking, &c. Now let us see regarding the efficacy of this sacrament. For its efficacy is græter and stronger than that of any other thing whatever; because it so much confirms him that devoutly receives it (as long as he does not through His own weakness cast it away from him) that he suffers no temptation of the devil, since the devil is overcome and bound back by the communicant's receiving this eucharist: and although the man that is in such a state always has (the devil) in

---

in memoriam Sui fieri instituit. Sic enim in sacramento Christum præ oculis habere debemus tanquam ad passionem ductum, passum et crucifixum pro nobis, quæ representatio dilectionis illius nos memores facit, quem Ipse nobis exhibuit. Unde et majori dilectione et pro Se patiendum accendimur: quæ vicaria dilectio et Illum nobis et nos Illi conjungit... Notandum quod panis ille ante consecrationem panis est, et vinum similiter vinum est. Post consecrationem vero et panis corpus Christi et vinum sanguis. Sic igitur verum corpus Christi est, imo Ipse Christus. Hoc corpus sacramentum est illius corporis Christi, quod est ecclesia... Sanguinis autem sacramentum Spiritus ecclesie, quod per septiformem gratiam vivificat et in eâ operatur. De aquâ non legimus quod Christus huic sacramento addiderat... De fractione illâ, quæ ibi apparet, ambigi solet an ipsum corpus Christi, sicut vere est ibi, ita in veritate frangatur. Sed dicimus quod sicut esse videtur panis, et non est... sic videtur frangi, cum fractionem nullam recipiat, &c. Nunc de efficacîâ hujus sacramenti videamus. Efficacia enim hujus major est fortior est quam alicujus alterius, quia in tantum confirmat quod qui devote accipit (quamdiu per infirmitatem suam ipsum non a se rejicit) nullam diaboli tentationem patitur, quia per hujus eucharistiæ acceptionem diabolus vincitur et religatur; et licet in se, qui talis

him, yet the (sacrament) itself always receives him [*i.e.* his assaults] and makes its dwelling-place in him." [NOTE. It might be rendered "yet he always lies in wait to meet the devil's attacks," but the latter clause will not run with this.]

---

est, semper habeat (diabolum), tamen ipsum (sacramentum) semper excipit, et in eo habitaculum facit.

(I.) ST BERNARD, OF LES CLAIRS VAUX. B. 1091. D. 1153.

There is no question more delicate and hardly any more important in its consequences than the settlement of the rival claims of truth and customary belief. This question is commonly described as the battle between authority and truth. But we can imagine cases when authority is on the side of truth and error has possession of the subject multitudes. The question in a partial form is tradition *v.* Scripture; but then there is great need to watch that mere received senses of Scripture be not adroitly or obstinately set down as Scripture. In short the other question, What are the true principles of interpreting Scripture? underlies this, and must be settled first. Therefore to return to the right general statement—the rival claims of customary belief and truth—we should say that it furnishes the severest test of a great man's character. For instance if St Bernard, born of a high French family and walking among the greatest ones of the earth, whenever it pleased him (*deos propius contingens*), is found to set the average current of their opinions above his own honest convictions of truth, or to be overbiassed by that current of opinion in forming his own convictions, the moral estimate of his character must proportionably fall.

That he used the favour of the great in trampling down Abailard can hardly be disputed. But he was on his own account a man of great vehemence of character. One would give much for his photograph or for such a picture of him as we get of Chancellor Gerson. Bernard could stand up for France's church-liberties against the Pope. He could shew the indispensable necessity of maintaining freedom of the human will in order to establish human responsibility. See *Tractatus de Gratia*, Vol. I.; and these things and the like are in his favour. But it is far easier to coin the titles of "the mellifluous doctor," and "the eminent doctor"

(Innocent III. called him "egregius") and "last of fathers but not "least," than to prove that he merited the loftier name of a faithful receiver and champion of truth wherever and in whatever company it appeared. I doubt his having deserved that greatest of titles. The pure love of truth in absolute perfection is one of the lofty points of the Divine nature; and all lower beings become elevated in the proportion in which they approach to this great excellence. He was however essentially a man of action: and contemplation, instead of changing him, made him yet more such. It is not to his glory that he was the greatest crusader after the renowned Peter: for the Crusades were a very bad way of doing a very good thing. To check the Turkish torrent was essential: but to lead away the flower of the population and to pour the nations' wealth into the ever-open hands of the church, in order to erect a Christian kingdom before its time in Palestine that palmers might swarm thither and back in safety, seems alike bad patriotism and corrupt religion. One marvels not that a king of the low intellectual calibre of St Louis should have given himself to it again and again: but the higher claims of St Bernard to mental power make us ashamed to see him foremost in that most mad adventure, which poured Europe upon Asia in successive ages in vain. Yet St Bernard must ever be regarded with veneration, and studied with gratitude. His volumes of letters, treatises, meditations and sermons are a valuable contribution to church literature; but the extracts made on the question of the supper of the Lord will go far to explain, if not to justify, the foregoing estimate of the man. His life and exploits of St Malachy, Bishop in Ireland, will take rank with the larger narrative of wonders compiled by Gregory the Great with the same object. These strings of imaginary stories were once thought an important branch of Christian evidence. It would be beside our subject to give chap. 24, a woman dead without the sacrament of extreme unction brought to life; but a full extract from his address upon three sacraments of our Lord, will furnish a specimen of that oratorical power that won the hearts of all that heard him; and then a letter, c. v., about his bringing his dead sister's soul into heaven by private masses, shall follow a story from his life of St Malachi.

St Bernard was one of seven children—to all of whom the praise of piety is assigned—in a village of Burgundy named

Fontaine. At 22 we find him one of thirty monks at Citeaux, all drawn together out of the world by his young eloquence. He did not however found Clairvaux and become its abbot till he was 24 (i.e. 1115). It was in a wild bare region marked with the reproach of bearing wormwood, absinthe, which had not then been raised—or shall we not say degraded—into furnishing the most deleterious of French intoxicating drinks. It was in the diocese of Langres, of which William Champeaux had become bishop. Bernard had half killed himself by his austerities and had to be restrained. In 1128 he is busy at Troyes at a council arranging rules for a new order of knights for the recovery of the holy sepulchre, to be called Templars. After that he takes a great part in many affairs of Pope Innocent II. against the antipope Anacletus, who died in 1138. After this he was not long in committing himself to the almost internecine strife with Abailard and Arnold of Brescia. Next we see Bernard preaching up the new Crusade for Pope Eugene at Vezelai to an enormous crowd, who rent the air with shouts, “It is the will of God.” After all due allowances for the men and the age I look on it as a sickening spectacle; and Bernard has a soul worthy of so much better things. His last work was on self-examination, and his last act was to stop a bloody strife at Metz. He then returned to Clairvaux and died aged 63. Eugene had preceded him to the tomb.

P. 147. “On the Lord’s supper, For Baptism (qy.) the other sacrament, washing of feet. These are the days which we ought to observe; days full of piety and grace, by which also the minds of wicked men are stirred up to penitence. Since such is the force of those sacraments which are kept on those days, that they can themselves also cleave stony hearts and suffice to soften every breast though it be made of iron. Finally, we see even to this day at the passion of Christ not only heavenly things sympathize but the earth too moves, and rocks are cleft, and in the confession of sins (hidden) memorials are laid open, &c.; for neither does a

P. 147.

*In Cœna Domini. De Baptismo, Sacram. alt. Ablutio pedum.*

Hi sunt dies quos observare debemus: dies pleni pietate et gratia, quibus etiam sceleratorum hominum mentes ad pœnitentiam provocantur. Tanta siquidem est vis sacramentorum eorum quæ diebus istis recoluntur, ut possint ipsa quoque lapidea scindere corda, et pectus omne, licet ferreum, emollire sufficiant. Denique videmus usque hodie ad passionem Christi non modo cœlestia compati sed terram moveri et petras sciindi, et in confessione peccatorum aperiri monumenta, &c.

mother give a nut to her little one whole but breaks it and offers it the kernel. So I also, dearest brethren, owed it to you to open, if I could, to you the sacraments which were shut up in mystery; but because I am imperfectly able, let us ask that for you and for me alike the mother of wisdom may break those nuts; nuts I say which the priest's rod has brought forth, the rod of virtue, which the Lord has sent forth out of Sion. There are indeed many sacraments, and an hour is not sufficient for enquiring into all. Perhaps also some of you are weak to take in so great things at once, &c. A sacred thing or a sacred secret is called a sacrament... A ring is of no value at all in comparison, but it was the inheritance which I was seeking. Approaching therefore in this manner to His passion, the Lord has taken care to invest His own with His own grace, that it might be shewn by some visible sign of invisible grace. For this were all sacraments instituted; for this the partaking of the eucharist; for this the washing of feet; for this finally baptism itself, the beginning of all the sacraments, &c. For as the signs are diverse in externals, &c., so the investitures are different according to the things concerning which they are invested [*i.e.* properly and at first with the robes of the estate]. To explain in a word, a canon is invested with a book, an abbot with a staff, a bishop with a staff and a ring; thus also there are divisions of grace in different sacraments, &c., &c. Of Baptism. That you may be secure, you have as an investiture the sacrament of the Lord's body and precious blood. For that sacrament works two ends in us; that is to say, the diminution of

---

[a specimen of his stirring commonplace eloquence]; neque enim tradit mater parvulo nucem integram sed frangit eam, et nucleum porrigit. Sic et ego vobis, fratres charissimi, si possem, sacramenta quæ clausa sunt aperire debueram; sed quia minus possum, rogemus ut vobis pariter et mihi mater sapientiæ frangat nuces istas; nuces inquam quas protulit sacerdotalis virga, virga virtutis, quam emisit Dominus ex Sion. Multa quidem sunt sacramenta, et scrutandis omnibus hora non sufficit. Fortassis etiam aliqui vestrum imbecilles sunt ad tanta simul capienda, &c. Sacramentum dicitur sacrum signum sive sacrum secretum... Annulus non valet quicquam, sed hæreditas est quam quærebam. In hunc itaque modum appropinquans passioni Dominus de gratiâ suâ investire curavit suos, ut invisibilis gratiæ signo aliquo visibili præstaretur. Ad hoc instituta sunt omnia sacramenta: ad hoc eucharistiæ participatio; ad hoc pedum ablutio; ad hoc denique ipse baptis-mus initium sacramentorum omnium, &c. Sicut enim in exterioribus diversa sunt signa, &c., variæ sunt investituræ secundum ea de quibus investimur. Verbi gratia, investitur Canonicus per librum, Abbas per baculum, Episcopus per baculum et annulum simul, &c. Sic et divisiones gratiarum diversis sunt traditæ sacramentis: &c., &c. De baptismo. Ut securi sitis, sacramentum Dominici corporis et sanguinis pretiosi investituram habetis. *Duo* enim illud sacramentum operatur

the power of sense in small offences, and the taking away all consent in the matter of the greater. If any one of you does not now so often, or does not feel such bitter emotions of anger, envy, luxury and other sins of this kind, let him give thanks to the body and blood of Christ, since the virtue of the sacrament is working in him, and let him rejoice because that very bad ulcer is approaching to a healthy condition.

P. 585. "In his life of St Malachi, Bishop of Munster, St Bernard contends for the truth of the bodily presence in the eucharist. There was a clergyman in Lismore (in Munster). That smatterer of knowledge in his own eyes presumed to say that in the eucharist there are only the sacrament (sacred sign) and not the reality of the sacrament, i.e. only sanctification and not the truth of the sacrament. Over him Malachi often spoke secretly and in assemblies but in vain. He was called to the midst, and yet apart from the laymen, that if it were possible he might be healed and not put to confusion. Therefore in the assembly of clergymen an opportunity of answering for his own opinion was given to the man. And when with all the powers of his mind, in which he was skilful above the average, he endeavoured to assert and to defend his error, Malachi disputing on the other side and convicting him, overcome by the judgment of all, he went out of the assembly confounded indeed but not put straight. For he said that he was not overcome by reason, but pressed down by the bishop's authority. 'And thou, O Malachi,' said he, 'hast without

---

in nobis; ut videlicet sensum minuatur in minimis, et in *gravioribus peccatis tollat omnino consensum*. Si quis vestrum non tam sæpe modo non tam acerbos sentiat iracundiæ motus, invidiæ, luxuriæ et cæterorum hujusmodi, gratias agat corpori et sanguini Domini quoniam virtus sacramenti operatur in eo, et gaudeat quod pessimum ulcus accedat ad sanitatem.

*Life of St Malachi, Bishop in Ireland. Vol. I. P. 585.*  
*Venice, 1781.*

Veritatem corp. Chr. in euch. propugnat. Fuit quidam clericus in Lesmor (in Mumonia, Cap. 4)... Is sciolus in oculis suis præsumpsit dicere in eucharistia esse tantummodo sacramentum et non rem sacramenti, i.e. solam sanctificationem et non *corporis veritatem*. Super quo a Malachiâ secreto et sæpe conventu sed incassum. Vocatus ad medium est, *seorsum tamen a laicis*, ut si fieri posset sanaretur et non confunderetur. Itaque in conventu clericorum data facultas homini est pro suâ sententiâ respondendi. Cumque totis ingenii viribus, quo non mediocriter callebat, asserere et defendere conaretur errorem, Malachiâ contra disputante et convincente, judicio omnium superatus de conventu confusus quidem exiit sed non correctus. Dicebat enim se non ratione victum sed episcopi pressum auctoritate. "Et tu," inquit, "O Malachia, sine causâ me hodie confudisti, adversus profecto

'cause confounded me to-day and hast spoken against truth and 'against thy own conscience.' Malachi, mournful for the man's being in so hardened a state; but grieving more for the injury done to the faith, in fear of danger calls the church together: he publicly rebukes the wanderer, and warns him publicly to return to good sense. When the bishops and all the clergy urged this course, on his not acceding, they pronounce anathema publicly proclaiming him a heretic. The man not even thus coming out of his dream said, 'Ye are all favouring man rather than 'truth. I accept not any person, to leave the truth.' At this word the holy (bishop) was secretly angry and said, 'May the Lord make thee confess the truth, even against thy will.' And when he said, 'Amen,' the assembly is dismissed. He with such a brand burnt into him was meditating flight, not enduring to be infamous and dishonoured. And straightway taking up his own things he was going out, when lo! seized with sudden weakness he stops, and with failing strength on the same spot casts himself on the ground panting and tired. By chance some insane vagabond happening to come to that very spot stumbles over him and asks what he does there. He answers, that he is held fast by a heavy infirmity, and has not strength either to go on or to return. And the other says 'That infirmity is no other than death.' But he did not say this of himself, but the Lord admirably by the insane person seized the man who when he was in health would not agree to the councils of those that had sense. And he adds 'Return home: I will help 'thee.' At last with this fool for guide he returns to the city, and comes back to the heart and to the pity of the Lord. In the same

---

"veritatem locutus et contra tuam ipsius conscientiam." Mæstus Malachias pro homine sic indurato, sed magis fidei dolens injuriam, timens periculum, ecclesiam convocat; errantem publice arguit, publice monet ut resipiscat. Suadentibus hoc ipsum episcopis et universo clero, *cum non acquiesceret*, contumaci *anathema dicunt* hæreticum protestantes. Nec sic evigilans, "Omnes," inquit, "favetis homini potius quam 'veritati; ego personam non accipio, ut deseram veritatem." Ad hoc verbum subtomachans sanctus (S. Malachias) "Dominus," inquit "fateri te veritatem faciat vel ex necessitate." *Quo respondente*, "Amen," solvitur conventus. Tali ille inustus cauterio fugam meditatur infamis atque inhonorus fore non sustinens. Et continuo sua tollens exibat, cum ecce subitâ correptus infirmitate sistit gradum, viribusque deficiens eodem loco jactat se super solum anhelus et fessus. Forte incidens in id loci vagabundus insanus quidam offendit hominem, "quidnam 'ibi agat" percontatur. Respondet, "gravi se infirmitate teneri "et neque procedere neque redire valentem." Et ille "infirmas ista "haud alia" inquit "quam ipsa mors est." Hoc autem non dixit a semet ipso, sed pulchre Dominus per insanum corripuit eum, qui sanus *acquiescere* noluit consiliis sensatorum. Et addit "Revertere "domum: ego te juvabo." Denique ipso duce revertitur in civitatem,



hour the bishop is sent for, the truth is acknowledged, the error is cast away. He confesses his guilt and is absolved, he seeks parting communion, and reconciliation is granted. Almost in one and the same moment his perfidy is cast away by the mouth, and he is destroyed by death. Thus to the admiration of all the word of Malachi was completed with all rapidity, and also of the Scripture that says, 'that trouble giveth understanding to the hearing,' Is. xxviii. 19.

Cap. V. "*He succours his dead sister with the offering of the sacrifice.* Having diligently settled the number of days that he had heard, he finds that it is the same during which he had not offered the bread for her. Then he goes to work again; she appears in a dark vest ... then in one half white ... then in a white. Plainly this sacrament can absorb her sins, and bring into Heaven those that return from earth."

---

redit ad cor et ad misericordiam Domini. Eadem horâ accitur episcopus, agnoscitur veritas, abjicitur error. Confessus reatum absolvitur, petit viaticum, datur reconciliatio: uno pæne momento perfidia ore abjicitur et morte diluitur. Ita, mirantibus cunctis sub omni celeritate completus est sermo Malachiæ et scripturæ pariter dicentis, quod vexatio dat intellectum auditui, Is. xxviii. 19.

*Cap. V. Sorori defunctæ sacrificii oblatione succurrit.*

Diligenter discusso numero dierum quem audierat, ipsum esse reperit ex quo pro eâ *panem de cælo vivum* non obtulisset. Tum... rursum adoritur...apparere in veste pullâ...in veste subcandidâ...in veste candida, &c...Hoc plane sacramentum potens peccata consumere...inferre cælis revertentes de terrâ.

(J.) GEROCH (GERHOHUS), ABBOT OF REICHENSPERG. B. 1093.  
D. 1169.

Chunrad, Bishop of Salzburg, the successor of Goteschalk, known from taking the high side in the election controversy, was patron of this divine. He raised him from the diaconate and sent him about to preach: which led to his elevation at about thirty-six to his final preferment, in which he spent above forty years. It was in Higher Austria. He always took the side of the popes in their struggle with the emperors. This was the cause of his leaving Augsburg and its bishop Herman in an earlier part of his life, when he became a monk in the Augustine convent of Rottenbrück in Higher Bavaria. He was one of the great men of his

time. His book on the Psalms used to fill eight volumes: but his pen was always ready: and that he feared no one is shewn by his writing even against Abailard. His writings have recently come into note: but he is appreciated in Germany. Our extracts will shew that he held strong views on the bodily presence. In fact he stood in high repute at the Roman court from the time that Chunrad brought him forward. Only be it remembered that we are on delicate subjects, for Mary, as Nestorius said, was the mother of Him Who was God, but she was not the mother of God, Θεοτόκος, Θεομήτωρ, &c., and the infelicitous assertion of that council led to a plentiful growth of Mary-worship; and we of the church of England are no more bound to that saying of the third council or to the Mary-worship that followed than any other Protestants are. "Councils have erred" saves us from all such charges.

P. 1117. "On the Son of Man's Glory and Honour. But to return to the leprous man mentioned above, who adored Christ and confessed His omnipotence; such an example of a worshipper is worthy here to be set before the faithful who believe, that as He was then being adored in His own body, so also now He should be adored as present in the same body, mighty to cleanse him that adoreth and eateth Him. Therefore let the world, stained with sin's leprosy, believe that Christ Jesus remaining in the body in Heaven is none the less corporally in His own temple, which is the church, which He feeds with His own body and blood, not only as far as the sacred sign, as one Berengarius determined, and as a blaspheming follower of the same Berengarius, whom I have before mentioned, still determines, but in the truth of the thing (itself), so that the true body of the same Christ, received from the virgin, is made present on the altar,

---

*Opera, Migne, Vol. II. p. 1117. De Gloria et Honore Filii Hominis.*

Ut autem redeamus ad supra memoratum leprosum, Christi adoratorem et omnipotentis Ejus confessorem, digne hic talis adorator est proponendus in exemplum fidelibus id credentibus, quod sicut tunc adorabatur in corpore Suo, sic etiam nunc adoretur præsens in eodem corpore Suo, potens mundare adorantem et manducantem Se. Credat igitur mundus peccati lepra inquinatus quod Christus Jesus, corporaliter manens in cælo, nihilominus corporaliter sit in templo Suo, quod est ecclesia, quam pascit corpore et sanguine Suo, non solum sacramento tenuis, ut voluit quidam Berengarius, et adhuc vult prænotatus blasphemus ejusdem Berengarii pedissequus, sed in rei veritate ita ut ipsius Christi verum corpus, de virgine sumptum, in altari præsentetur

sacrificed and eaten, and further is adored unto salvation. [Then Augustine.] And as Berengarius himself whom I just now spoke of denied this, he was compelled to deny this his own pestiferous doctrine and to abjure it in a public council, and silence was imposed on him. But now there has risen up in his place that blasphemer rightly named Folmar, as blowing a bitter bellows, who affirms in his sayings and in his writings that the Lord's body has never been under the sky from the time He ascended: and when we were saying among other objections that many of the saints have seen Him in the body after He ascended into Heaven, as He was seen in the body by Peter, when He said to him, 'I am coming to Rome to be crucified again,' he (Folmar) said that all this was fabulous and did not rest on the sacred Scriptures, &c. [Appearances to Saul in N. T., &c., &c.] IV. From this it appears that what the holy church perceives on the altar is not to be named the body of a man, as the heretic Nestorius determined, but the body of the Lord. And because Nestorius, just now mentioned, denied this, he was condemned with this doctrine of his own in the synod at Ephesus; and as a confutation of the same plague-bearing doctrine the orthodox fathers said and left in writing, &c., &c. Therefore they are anathema and alien from holy church who think that the living and life-giving body of the Lord is in such a manner circumscribed in some spot of Heaven, and after a certain mode, a thing impious to utter, imprisoned [in that spot] so that it cannot in one and the same moment be with its whole substance in many places, just as He will, and just

---

immoletur manducetur, ac proinde salubriter adoretur. Augustine quoted. Quod quia negavit jam dictus Berengarius ipse, doctrinam suam hanc pestiferam damnare atque abjurare coactus est in concilio publico, imposito sibi silentio. Sed nunc in ejus locum surrexit ille blasphemus recte nominatus Folmarus quasi foliis amarus, dictis et scriptis affirmans corpus Domini, ex quo ascendit, nunquam fuisse sub cœlo. Cui cum nos inter cœtera objiceremus, quod multi sanctorum Eum viderint corporaliter postquam ascendit in cœlum, sicut corporaliter visus est Petro, quando Ei dixit, Venio Romam iterum crucifigi (Acts xxviii. 14)! dixit hoc totum esse fabulosum neque canonicis fultum Scripturis, &c. &c. IV. Unde id quod in altari sancta percipit ecclesia, non corpus hominis, ut Nestorius hæreticus voluit, sed corpus Domini est nominandum. Quod quia negavit jam dictus Nestorius, in Synodo Ephesinâ cum suâ doctrina damnatus est: atque ad ejusdem pestiferæ doctrinæ confutationem patres orthodoxi dixerunt et scriptum reliquerunt, &c. &c. [See Marius Mercator, extracts.] Anathema igitur et alieni sunt a sanctâ ecclesiâ qui corpus Domini vivum et vivificum putant in aliquo loco cœli taliter circumscriptum et quodammodo, quod dictu nefas est, incarcerationatum, ut non possit uno eodemque momento multis in locis totaliter esse, prout vult, et

as the salvation of man requires, because [as we urge] the same body has been assumed into the Godhead.

P. 1180. "There is indeed even to sinners and those that unworthily receive within the church, a true flesh of Christ and a true blood, but it is in a sacramental species and true fleshly essence (which profiteth not at all) not in the thing itself nor in its efficacy."

This shews that sacramental participation does not always in the fathers mean eating *the bread*, but (at least sometimes) eating Christ's true natural body, including its essence or substance. At least this is how this generally clear writer uses the words. Of course this differs from the opinion of Augustine quoted by the Church of England in her Articles. But the first longer extract is invaluable not only because it is so plainly expressed in direct opposition to the Reformed divines who write upon Christ's body being very humanity circumscribed or limited, just as ours, only without sin, as His unquestionably was when He rose and appeared to the disciples: but also because this long extract, being more clearly expressed than ordinary, enables persons to see whether they agree on the point of the natural limitation of Christ's humanity with the Church of England, or with the Cyrils and the Council of Ephesus. Christ's body is most truly the body of His manhood though there is no objection to calling it the body of the Lord, *i.e.* the body of Him Who was also the Lord.

prout exigit salus hominum, propter quod idem corpus assumptum est in Deum.

P. 1180 B.

Est quidem etiam peccatoribus et indigne sumentibus intra ecclesiam vera Christi caro verusque sanguis, sed specie sacramentali, et carnis (quæ non prodest quidquam) verâ essentiâ non re aut rei efficientiâ.

(K.) PETER THE SINGER (PETRUS CANTOR). D. 1198.

He spent his life in Paris as reader of lectures in the University and precentor in its cathedral. He was born most probably in that city, though the honour is otherwise assigned to Rheims. From his position as Rector of the theological school he refused to

remove, though the bishopric of Tournay was pressed upon him by the united voices of the people, the clergy and the king. As the saying is, he preferred *generare patres*: nor can any limit be set to the usefulness of a man endowed with fine powers and excellent graces in such a position. His great work, a *Summa* on moral science, bears its opening words as its title, *Verbum abbreviatum*. He also wrote a *Grammar* of Theologians, reputed to be of great value for students of the holy Scriptures. He wrote also a kind of Bible Dictionary called his *Abel* from its first article, a Great *Summa* on the sacraments, a book on the apparent contrarieties in the Bible, another on Scripture allegories, and commentaries on many books of the Bible. He died about five years before the universal doctor of Lille.

P. 102. "Against the venality and multiplication of masses. Augustine scarcely allows a single reception in (each) day. Would he then at all, had he been asked, have allowed anyone to celebrate it twice in a day? Away with the idea! But he would have repelled such a man with all his might, and perhaps would have struck him with an anathema.

P. 104. "Against masses of many faces (*i.e.* for the benefit of more than one person). We nowhere read of a mass of two or three faces. 1 Cor. xi. But now there is a sevenfold or a greater multiplication in a mass, and the mystery and service of the mass are both confused.

P. 111. "When the Lord forbad a stranger, a traveller or an unclean person eating of the passover lamb, how much more would He forbid a sinner, not yet made a citizen and of the household of God, eating of the true Lamb, a stained person of the Unstained.

*Opera, Migne, Vol. CCV. Verbum Abbreviatum, p. 102.*

Contra venalitatem et pluralitatem missarum...Augustinus unicam sumptionem in die vix concedit...numquid interrogatus concessisset alicui bis in die conficere? Absit! Sed totis viribus talem repulisset et forte anathemate percussisset.

P. 104.

Contra missas multarum facierum nusquam legitur missa duarum vel trium facierum 1 Cor. xi. Sed nunc in missâ septies vel pluries triplicatur, mysteriumque et ordo missæ confunditur.

P. 111.

Cum Dominus prohibuerit ne advena peregrinus vel immundus comederet de agno paschali, quanto magis ne peccator, nondum civis et domesticus Dei factus, de vero Agno, maculatus de Immaculato? From Hildebertus Cænomanis; and there is much more like it.

P. 243. "From this little cell of words, 'This is My body,' we draw out the faith that is held regarding the body of Christ. If this, as a Manichean makes it by his exposition, *i.e.* if 'this is My body,' *i.e.* a certain representing of My body and no more, or to this effect, you would at once diverge by explaining it otherwise than the catholic faith holds it. It seems to be thus in the commandments of moral things, which indeed are easy and want no exposition, if only they were completed in act, as they ought to be completed, as it is among the articles of faith.

P. 310. "But there are two sides of truth, *i.e.* the side of the word itself, and this is the philosopher's side. And there is the truth of the utterer which lies in the object the speaker has, whether what he say be false or true. A priest's words are either true or they are sacrilegious; they are true by the disposition to speak true, more than by mere truth." [How much superior to Coleridge in "The Friends."]

P. 243 B.

Ex hac cellulâ verborum, Hoc est corpus Meum (Matt. xxvi.), elicitor fides de corpore Christi habita. Si hoc, ut Manichæus exponens, scilicet hoc est corpus Meum, id est quædam repræsentatio corporis Mei et non aliud, vel in hunc modum, aliter exponendo quam teneat fides catholica, statim deviares. Ita videtur esse in mandatis morum, quæ quidem facilia sunt et nulla expositione indigent, si implerentur in opere, quæ etiam impleri debent, quasi de articulis fidei est. Augustinus, Tract. vi. in Johan.

P. 310.

Est autem duplex veritas; dicti scilicet...et hæc est philosophi. Et est veritas dicentis, quæ est in proposito dicentis, sive falsum dixerit sive verum...Verba sacerdotis aut vera sunt aut sacrilega: vera veracitate potius quam veritate.

(L.) PETER THE LOMBARD, BISHOP OF PARIS. B. 1139.

D. 1164.

As Professor of Theology there, he endeavoured to put a bridle on the scholastic method of treating theological subjects and to arrest the unbelief, to which it had already given birth. His mode of aggression was to supply a comparatively small commonplace-book of the leading Christian fathers, to which he gave the name, "The book of the Sentences:" hoping by adducing these as authorities to dam up the running stream of free enquiry. His book was so well done that it was a great help to every one, and everybody got it transcribed. When Huss went to prison in Constance

he had but two books with him—this work of Peter Lombard and the Bible. But one purpose of the Lombard was singularly defeated. The liberals of the day adopted his convenient work as the text-book of their discussions, and crowned him with the title of “Master of the Sentences,” and thenceforward he was crowned as the king of the scholastic divines. It was the very different book of John Scotus, on the Eucharist, that, if it had survived and been closely studied, might have curbed the mania: but no attempt in that direction was made for centuries. Lombard prolonged the reign of the fathers. The Lombard was a native of Novara and became a pupil at Bologna and went to Paris to learn theology, where he became supreme. Bernard is the first cause of all his triumph, since it was he that sent him to school at Rheims.

Perhaps after the apostle and the royal founder of the power of Russia, this Bishop of Paris is the most prominent of all the Peters whom the world has known. His exploit has been attempted by others. It was just to make an every-man's edition of the opinions of the fathers. Among these must be reckoned William of Champeaux, Hugh of St Victor and Pulleyn in England. Jansen made the attempt with Augustine alone. But there is but one Peter Lombard. He exposes occasionally the errors and contradictions to be found in particular cases; and he may well not fear to do this, seeing their excellent sayings pass all reckoning. It is likely that he was moved by the effects that Abailard's bold career of thought had produced. Lombard's work has been the subject of many commentators. It is hardly wonderful that in one sentence the Master of the Sentences has made a palpable slip, which has met with due condemnation at the Pope's hands. But it is singular that he penned such a sentence as that Jesus Christ considered as a man is nothing at all. One would feel inclined to give it a reasonable interpretation, to which it would be easy enough to change a saying so monstrously expressed.

L. IV. D. VII. “By baptism we are cleansed. By the eucharist we are thoroughly furnished in that which is good. Baptism ex-

---

*L. IV. D. VII. Louvain, 1567.*

Per baptismum mundamur. Per eucharistiam in bono consummatur. Baptismus æstus vitiorum extinguit. Eucharistia spiritualitate

tinguishes the heats (or tides) of vices. The eucharist refreshes in spirituality. Whence it is exceedingly well called the eucharist, good grace; because there is in this sacrament not only an argument for virtue and grace, but the whole Christ is received, Who is the fount and origin of the whole supply of grace... This heavenly manna ought not to be furnished to any but those that are born again... These two sacraments were shewn, when water and blood flowed down from Christ's side; Who came to redeem us from the devil and sin by blood and the water of ablution; as He by the blood of the paschal lamb delivered the Israelites from extermination, and by the water of the Red Sea from the Egyptians. Whence, as Ambrose says, 'it is given us to understand that the holy things of Christians were earlier than those of the Jews.' Eusebius of Emesa (says), Because He was about to take away from our eyes the body that He had assumed and to carry it into Heaven among the stars, it was necessary that on the day of the (Paschal) supper He should consecrate a sacrament for us, that that (body) might be continually worshipped in a mystery, which was once for all offered as the price (of our redemption). A consecration, and in what words? 'Take ye, eat ye, all, of it. This is My body:' and Augustine, We must believe that the sacraments [i.e. the repeated observances of this sacrament] are established by those words of Christ. All that remains is nothing else than praises and entreaties of the faithful and their requests... Therefore the Lord Jesus... under the form of bread and wine so delivered to them His own body and blood, that He might shew that the old sacraments of the law were ended by His own death and that the sacraments of the new law were substituted for

---

reficit. Unde excellenter eucharistia dicitur, bona gratia; quia in hoc sacramento non modo est argumentum virtutis et gratiæ, sed *Ille totus sumitur* qui est fons et origo totius gratiæ... Hoc cœleste manna non nisi renatis præstare debet... Hæc duo sacramenta demonstrata sunt, ubi de latere Christi sanguis et aqua profluxerunt: qui (Christus) per sanguinem redempturus et aquam ablutionis nos redimere venit a diabolo et peccato; sicut Israelitas per sanguinem agni paschalis ab exterminatore, et per aquam maris rubri ab Ægyptiis liberavit. Unde, ut ait Ambrosius, "intelligi datur, anteriora esse sancta Christianorum quam Judæorum." Eusebius Emissenus (ait), Quia corpus assumptum ablaturus erat ab oculis et illaturus sideribus, necesse erat ut die cœnæ sacramentum nobis consecraret, ut coleretur jugiter per mysterium, quod semel offerebatur pretium. Consecratio, quibus et verbis? Take, eat, all, of it. This is My body, &c. Augustinus. Credendum est quod in illis verbis Christi sacramenta confirmantur. Reliqua omnia nihil aliud sunt quam laudes vel obsecrationes fidelium et petitiones. Ep. LIX, Dominus igitur Jesus... sub specie panis et vini corpus et sanguinem Suum ita eis tradidit, ut ostenderet legis vetera sacramenta in morte Suâ terminari ac legis novæ sacramenta substitui... Sed non



them ... But he did not afterwards sanction the church custom for the future, that (the sacrament) should be taken after other food: but it ought rather to be taken by persons fasting, as the apostle says, that by peculiar reverence it may be differently judged, *i.e.* distinguished, from other things—a thing which the Lord left to be arranged by the apostles. Whence Augustine, &c. Three things are to be distinguished ... The visible form (appearance) of bread and wine is the sacred sign (sacrament) and not the thing (itself). Christ's own flesh and blood is a sacred sign and the thing. His mystic flesh [*i.e.* the feeding grace received, which is the thing mystically signified by Christ's flesh and blood which are themselves only figurative terms. The Latin words contain all this. How seldom is this true explanation given, *viz.* that the bread and wine are figures of Christ's body and blood, and that Christ's body and blood are figures of the grace which He gives to feed the soul: that is to say, holy thoughts, feelings, inclinations, and, following from these, holy resolves] is the thing itself and not a sacred sign ... And of this Christ's own proper body taken from the virgin is a sacred sign, because as Christ's body consists of many most pure and immaculate members, so the church's fellowship (society) consists of many persons free from criminal taint. As a type of which the ark of the Lord was made of many pieces of satin wood, which are incorruptible and like white thorn ... There are two modes of communicating; one sacramental [*i.e.* a partaking of the sacred sign], that is to say in which good and bad eat: the other spiritual, by which the good alone eat. Whence Augustine, &c. No one can doubt that any one is at that time made a partaker of Christ's body when he is made a member of Christ even if he depart from this world before he eats that bread and drinks that cup ... It

---

exinde disciplinam sanxit in posterum, ut post alios cibos sumatur: sed potius a jejunis sumi oportet, sicut apostolus dicit, ut singulari reverentia dijudicetur, *i.e.* discernatur ab aliis rebus, quod Dominus apostolis disponendum reliquit. Unde Augustinus, &c. Sunt tria distinguenda ... Sacramentum, et non res, est species visibilis panis et vini. Sacramentum et res caro Christi propria et sanguis. Res et non sacramentum mystica Ejus caro... Cujus etiam sacramentum est corpus Christi proprium de virgine sumptum, quia ut corpus Christi ex multis membris purissimis et immaculatis constat, ita societas ecclesiastica ex multis personis, a criminali macula liberis, consistit. In cujus rei typo facta est arca Domini de lignis setini, quæ sunt imputribilia et albæ spinæ similia. Duo modi communicandi; unicus sacramentalis: scilicet quo boni et mali edunt; alter spiritualis, quo soli boni manducant. Unde Augustinus, &c. Nulli ambigendum est tum quemquam corporis et sanguinis Christi participem fieri, quando Christi membrum efficitur, &c., etiam si antequam illum panem edat et sanguinem bibat de hoc

must be held without doubt that it is taken by the good, not only as a sacred sign but also spiritually; but that Christ's flesh taken from the virgin and His own blood shed for us (is received) by the wicked only as a sacred sign, *i.e.* under (the form of) a sacrament, that is to say under the visible appearance. Gregory and Augustine.

P. 399. "But like as others, transcending the madness of preceding (teachers), who, measuring God's power after the measure of natural things, very boldly and perilously contradict the truth—asserting that there is no body or blood on the altar, and that the substance of bread and wine is not converted into the substance of flesh and blood—but that Christ said, 'This is My body,' in the same way that the apostle said, 'but the rock was Christ.' For they say that the body of Christ is there only in a sacrament, *i.e.* in a sign, to be eaten by us. [This seems the place to notice that in the three Truths so well uttered before, there was just this one error, *viz.* to say that the body and blood of Christ in this sacrament are a sacred sign and a reality, *sacramentum et res*: for the body and blood are not really there, nor are they really received but only mystically, *i.e.* in a figure. Still Peter Lombard stands very high among such divines as Macarius, Origen, Theodore, Athanasius, Usher, Barrow, Tyndall, Sandys and Bullinger.] Augustine on the words, It is the Spirit that quickeneth, &c., We are not going to eat this body and to drink this blood, &c. [As said below, authorities to prove that Christ's body *is on* the altar. Then] On the mode of the conversion, whether it is in form or in substance or of both kinds, I am not competent to determine.

---

*sæculo...abscedat... Indubitanter tenendum est a bonis sumi non modo sacramentaliter sed etiam spiritualiter: a malis vero tantum sacramentaliter, i.e. sub sacramento, scilicet sub specie visibili, carnem Christi de virgine sumptum et sanguinem pro nobis fusum Suum. Greg. et Aug.*

*D. X. p. 399.*

Sicut autem alii, præcedentium insaniam transcendent, qui, Dei virtutem juxta modum naturalium rerum metientes, audacius et periculosius veritati contradicunt, asserentes in altari non esse Christi corpus vel sanguinem, nec substantiam panis vel vini in substantiam carnis et sanguinis converti; sed ita dixisse Christum, Hoc est corpus Meum, sicut apostolus dixit, Petra autem erat Christus. Dicunt enim ibi esse corpus Christi tantum in sacramento, *i.e.* in signo, manducari a nobis. Aug. on the words, It is the Spirit that quickeneth, &c. Non corpus hoc manducaturi et bibituri illum sanguinem. After this come authorities to prove that the true body of Christ *is on* the altar, *e.g.* Ambrose and Augustine, &c. Then, De modo conversionis an formalis an substantialis vel alterius generis, definire non sufficio. Formalem tamen non esse cognosco, quia species rerum quæ ante fuerunt

Yet that there is any conversion of the form I do not know, because the appearances of the things (*i.e.* of the bread and wine), which were before, continue, and the taste and the weight. The priests are said to make the body and blood of Christ. The bread becomes flesh and the wine's substance becomes blood; and yet nothing is added to the body and blood, nor is Christ's body and blood augmented." [I notice once again how sadly an error once decidedly affirmed by a great man holds its ground and perverts the church for ages. Jerome at the end of the fourth century several times uses the words "*conficere corpus Christi*," or equivalent terms; and here in the twelfth century Peter Lombard, who was to be for centuries the favourite author, comes astonishingly near to the simple truth of Scripture; but this one rock on the path, this one word "*conficere*," seems above all other terms used by others to stand in his way, and shut him out from ascending to the higher level; so the Reformation was delayed still longer.]

---

remanent et sapor et pondus. Sacerdotes dicuntur *conficere corpus Christi et sanguinem*. Panis fit caro, et substantia vini fit sanguis: nec tamen aliquid additur corpori vel sanguini; nec augetur corpus Christi vel sanguis.

(M.) ALANUS OF THE ISLANDS, DOCTOR UNIVERSALIS.

B. 1114. D. 1203.

A long and difficult dispute—first, whether there were two equally eminent Cistercians of this name, and secondly where each of them lived—has subsided into the conclusion that there was but one, and that his life just ran out of the 12th into the 13th century, though it nearly coincided with the whole twelfth century. His birth is set at 1114, and his death was three years after the end of the century. His marble monument yet presents a legible inscription in the cloister on the left after you have entered the church. The lax versification of the inscription describes him as "*qui totum scibile scivit*." Another epitaph represents him as "worthy of the whole world's admiration," and in one condensed portion says of him "*reſeravit naturam, mores, mystica verba Dei*."

Lille (*Insulæ*) was the capital of French Flanders. While Alanus was young, Theodoric of Alsatia was called to be Count of Flanders. He went thence to St Bernard of Clairvaux. In 1139 he became first abbot of Riparium on the appointment of Bishop Hatto; and he rose to be Rector of the University of Paris and Bishop of Auxerre (*Autissiodorum*) in 1151. After the Lateran council he

wrote against the Waldenses and Albigenses. His works are too numerous to recite here. But his first attempt related to the prophecies of Merlin in England. The strange thing is that all the events of his life bring him into the 12th century, but his first epitaph mentioned above makes it the thirteenth.

“Mille ducenteno nonageno quoque quarto,  
Christo devotus mortales exiit artus.”

P. 202. “She (the Virgin Mary) is that famous Jerusalem, in which the true Solomon built up a solemn temple. And it can with yet more reason be reckoned Jerusalem, *i.e.* the vision of peace, than that in which the peace of eternity rested, in which the true Solomon, *i.e.* Christ was formed, the temple of His own body, of which it is said, ‘Destroy this temple, &c.’ But in the forming of this temple neither hammer nor axe was heard ... But because three altars belonged to the temple of Solomon, the first of whole burnt-offerings on which animals were slain, the second of incense on which they offered aromatics, the third propitiatory on which the glory of God appeared; so in the temple of Christ, *i.e.* in His human nature, three altars come out; first there is the altar of burnt-offerings, *i.e.* His glorious flesh, on which ours have been consumed; secondly, that of His soul, because as on the altar of incense (different) kinds of incense were offered, so the soul of Christ is filled with various excellences; thirdly, that of His Divinity, in which there shines forth the majesty of Divine authority. [Not offered, but present and propitiated, the blood being brought in as a memorial of the sacrifice at the door of the sanctuary, and sprinkled to cleanse that holy of holies. Then follows that a triple purging

*Sermo II. Opera, Migne, Vol. CCX. p. 202.*

Hæc (*i.e.* V. M.) est famosa illa Jerusalem, in qua verus Ille Salomon templum solenne exstruxit. Quæ enim consequentius censeri posset Jerusalem, *i.e.* visio pacis, quam illa in quâ quievit pax æternitatis, in quâ verus Salomon, *i.e.* Christus, fabricatus est, templum Sui corporis, de quo dictum est, Solvite templum hoc, &c. (Joh. ii.). Sed in fabricatione hujus templi neque malleus neque securis est audita ... Quia autem ad templum Salomonis tria pertinebant altaria, primum holocaustorum, in quo mactabantur animalia, secundum thymiamatis; in quo offerebant aromatica, tertium propitiatorium in quo apparebat gloria Divina; ita in templo Christi, *i.e.* in Ejus humanâ naturâ, tria resultant altaria: primum altare est holocaustorum, scilicet caro Ejus gloriosa [he does not mean this word in the same sense as in 1 Cor. xv.] in quâ nostra sunt consumpta [then this first is propitiatory], secundum animæ, quia sicut in altari thymiamatis offerebantur aromaticæ species, sic anima Christi variis virtutibus referta est; tertium Divinitatis in quâ elucescit Divinæ auctoritatis majestas.

of our hearts is required from luxury, dust and mud, the three polluters of the house into which God is to be received. That which such a man thought worth writing we may well deem worthy of self-application.]

P. 204. Ps. lx. "In sacraments He gave a banner, signifying because a sacrament is no other thing than a sign of invisible grace, as baptism and confirmation. But the form of visible bread on the altar designates the Lord's invisible flesh. Those signs are 'dark-nesses,' of which Ps. xviii. speaks: for Divine grace lies hid or is contained under the sacraments, whence also they themselves are called vessels, as Matt. xxv., where it is said, 'Hide oil in your vessels,' and Isaiah li., 'Be ye clean that bear the Lord's vessels.' These vessels with some are empty, with some are half full; but in some they are full, with apostates they are empty.

P. 359. "Against heretics, *i.e.* Waldenses, Jews, Pagans, &c. The opinion of the heretics who deny that the bread is transubstantiated into Christ's body by the sacred words said by the priest in the mass. Answers, (1) One change is the being turned into another thing; (2) Another being in it; (3) Transubstantiation an interchange of substances only.

P. 360. "None of the bread's substance remains either as refers to matter or to substance, but some of the accidental properties. [Must we not say then that in respect of these "accidents," what-

*P. 204, Ps. LIX. (LX.), "Thou hast given a banner"*  
(*Lat. significationem*).

In sacramentis dedit significationem, quia nil aliud sacramentum quam invisibilis gratiæ signum... So baptism and confirmation. Forma autem panis visibilis in altari invisibilem Domini carnem designat. Istæ sunt tenebræ, de quibus in Psalmis dicitur Ps. xvii. (xviii). Latet enim sive continetur sub sacramentis Divina gratia, unde et ipsa vasa dicuntur in Evangelio, Matth. xxv., ubi dicitur, Oleum recondite in vasis vestris, et Is. li. Mundamini qui fertis vasa Domini. [Singular both instances.] Hæc vasa in quibusdam sunt vacua, in quibusdam semiplena, in quibusdam vero plena, in apostatis vacua sunt, &c.

*P. 359.*

*Contra hæreticos, i.e. Waldenses, Judæos, Paganos, &c., Lib. I., c. 57.*

Opinio hæreticorum qui negant panem transubstantiari in corpus Christi... per sancta verba quæ a sacerdote dicuntur in missâ. [C. 58.] Answers, mutationum alia est alteratio, alia alteritas, alia transubstantiatio. [In (1) change in accidents, in (2) in substantialia though the subject-matter remains, in (3) when both the last are changed.]

*P. 360.*

Nihil de substantiâ (panis) remanet vel quantum ad materiam vel quantum ad substantiam, sed quædam accidentalia.

ever is their physical explanation the bread is not so far changed into Christ's body? and we have no idea of imperceptible accidents, so we might argue that the change is only in the substances. Therefore after all only the substance and not the accidents of Christ's body would be there, *i.e.* Christ's whole body is not there, but only its substance. So "This is my body" is not verified (in the Roman literal way)].

P. 362. "They say indeed that none of the accidents of bread are there—but that they seem to be there. [This does not help at all.] For there are many kinds of deceived vision. But it is not for jugglery, *i.e.* to cheat, because this is not done to deceive but to instruct and for a sacrament.

P. 363. "Heretics also ask whether it be an article of the Christian faith that bread is transubstantiated into the body of Christ, since no mention is made of this in any creed... With reference to this some say that in the primitive church it was so patent to all that it was doubted by none, since Christ testified to it in the Gospel. Nor did any heresy break forth in the primitive church on this point, for the repression of which any change had to be recorded. But it may be said that mention is made of the eucharist in the Apostles' Creed, in the term 'The communion of saints.' For in this do holy persons spiritually communicate, when they receive Christ's body not only sacramentally but also spiritually. [This very nearly amounts to Pearson's spiritual interpretation of the clause.] The heretics' opinion is that He shewed Himself and not His body lying hid under the form (of bread and wine). As to the body the passage simply affirms the contrary. Also what will they say of the blood? Here the heretics cannot say that He

P. 362.

As to the accidents of bread remaining, Dicunt quidam nulla accidentia ibi esse...sed videri esse... Sunt enim multæ species fallaciæ visus... Non tamen est ad præstigium, quia hoc non fit ad decipiendum sed ad instruendum et ad sacramentum.

P. 363.

Quærent etiam hæretici utrum sit articulus fidei Christianæ panem transubstantiari in corpus Christi cum de hoc non fiat mentio in aliquo symbolo...ad hoc dicunt quidam quod in primitivâ ecclesiâ ita omnibus patebat, &c. quod nulli dubium erat, cum Christus hoc esset in evangelio testatus. Nec super hoc in primitivâ ecclesiâ ulla hæresis pullulavit, ad quam reprimendam opus esset mentionem fieri, &c. Dicit autem potest quod in apostolico symbolo fiat mentio de eucharistia, cum dicitur, Sanctorum communionem. In hoc enim spiritualiter communicant sancti, dum recipiunt corpus Christi non solum sacramentaliter sed etiam spiritualiter. [C. 61.] Opinio hæreticorum quod...demonstraverit Seipsum et non corpus quod sub forma latebat. As to the body simple counter statement. Then, Item quid de sanguine dicent? Hic non

*shewed* any other blood than that which He was handing in the cup, &c. [Just as if the Waldenses meant by Himself, His body and blood, when they meant His grace actually given and represented by all the figures of form and speech.] Why did He exhibit (or give) His body under a form not its own? It was becoming that He Who had retired from men as to the presence of the flesh, sitting on the Father's right hand, should sometimes visit us. [As to His human body this is not conceded but denied in Scripture.] Although He might be hidden under a form not His own, &c. To confound these heretics, there is celebrated a miracle in many churches, by which a kind of flesh has been seen in the host (sacrifice). [Who would take all this for the reasoning of the Doctor universus of Paris? He ends by begging the question of the authority of the literal sense.] It is most stupid to refuse to confess what Christ has confessed, what apostles testify, what all saints attest, (according to the faith) in which we see so many devout men end their lives.

P. 390. "It is evident the power of baptism or the eucharist or of another sacrament is not increased or diminished by whomsoever they are given ... Besides, if the merits of the ministers increased or diminished the power of prayers, the unity of the church would not stand: yea, a schism would take place: because some would follow a priest whom they might believe better, and they would fly from another whom they might think worse. [How well the Church of England takes the middle line!]

P. 678. "Theological rules. R. 107, Some say that Christ's body though broken yet remains entire, that it is divided and yet remains undivided. Others say that the breaking is in the form

possunt dicere quod ostenderet sanguinem Suum, nisi quem in calice porrigebat, &c. [C. 62.] Quare sub alienâ forma dedit corpus Suum ... Decens fuit ut Qui ab hominibus recesserat per præsentiam carnis sedens ad dexteram Patris, nos aliquando visitaret, quamvis sub aliena forma lateret, &c. In horum hæreticorum confusionem in pluribus ecclesiis celebratur miraculum, quo in hostiâ species carnis visa est... stultissimum est diffiteri quod Christus confessus est, quod apostoli testantur, quod omnes sancti attestantur, in quâ fide videmus tot viros religiosos vitam finire.

P. 390, *Lib. II. c. XIV.*

Patet quod vis baptismi vel eucharistiæ vel alterius sacramenti non augetur vel minuitur, a quocunque detur... Præterea si merita ministrorum augerent vel minuerent vim orationum, unitas ecclesiæ non staret: imo schisma fieret: quia quidam sequerentur sacerdotem quem crederent meliorem et fugerent alium quem putarent deteriorem, &c.

P. 678. *Theologicæ regulæ.*

Rule 107 as before, only shorter argument on the change of bread and wine, ending, Sunt qui dicunt corpus Christi frangi et tamen manere integrum, dividi et manere indivisum. Alii fractionem esse in ipsâ formâ.

itself (only). Others that nothing in it is broken, but that it only appears to be broken, as was said before. R. 108, The body of Christ is there in one species or kind (subordinate kind) and is (not) under another kind [*i.e.* the accidents both of the bread and wine and of the body and blood are there]. For in *that* form which He took of the virgin He is on the altar, but not in that indeed under the form of bread and wine." [One does not see why Alan might not as well affirm both substances to be there too.]

---

*Alii nihil ibi frangi sed videri frangi, ut prædictum est. Rule 108, In aliâ specie est corpus Christi, et sub aliâ specie est. In illâ enim formâ, quam assumpsit de virgine, est in altari, sed non sub illâ imo sub formâ panis et vini.*

(N.) INNOCENT III. (LOTHARIO CONTI). B. 1161. D. 1216.

Gregory VII. and Innocent III. seem to me to stand apart from the rest of the popes, as, if I may say it, the great twin brethren, the Castor and Pollux of the Papal power. But it is difficult adequately to portray or even to sketch their characters. To rant against them, even to reason against them, were very easy; their ambition, their severity, and at times their unscrupulous pursuit of their chosen aims, have left ample room and verge enough for both rant and reason to display themselves. But a misgiving arises whether this is all—whether their characters were not chequered with noble professional desires. I do not say this out of blind charity, though “hoping all things” is given us as one good mark of Christian love. Nor do I put it simply as a spiritual fact which may be contended for—that bad men even in the highest places are not so wholly surrendered to evil, as not to have some love of good, and some wishes to promote its prevalence. Such men have worked at intervals with that object, and have had better feelings for the time strangely mingled with their ruling passions of pride and hatred and the rest. Then why should not this and more be true of both these remarkable men? And should not Gregory’s own assertion in his well-known letter to Hugo of Cluny—that his leading object was to reform the clergy according to his own ideas—receive some credit? Every writer concurs in describing the corruption of the entire system of clerical preferment as having vitiated the great mass of the clerical body. Must not Gregory have felt this? and then who can reject Gregory’s own private saying in starting on his work,



that he "felt himself such a sinner, that he cast himself for salvation on the merits of Christ alone"? See e.g. Neander, vol. VII. And may we not believe that he long worked with a desire to obtain a pure clergy, when he mistakenly made their celibacy his cardinal aim respecting them? He seems to have despaired of amending the worldly and self-seeking laity till he should have reformed the clergy. And to Innocent also may we not assign a similar mistaken belief, that could he get the change of the sacramental elements more systematically laid down by a more philosophical enunciation of the mystery, he should have done much toward augmenting the reforming power of sacramental doctrine on the lives first of the clergy and then of the people? If any who read this prefer to turn their faces away from these suggestions, and to paint these two popes as all black—black as the blackest night—no doubt they may get many to follow them in these views. But I very much fear it is true that the partial mixture of a desire for good with the ruling practice of evil in very corrupt minds is no apology at all for their general criminality, but rather the contrary. I look on the power to say "*video meliora proboque*," as but a testimony that the moral sense is not extinguished, and I believe that this *remainder* of its presence is an inward protest for God against evil conduct, the resisting of which renders evil conduct yet more truly guilty. The unquestionably carnal and at times unscrupulous passions, which had full dominion over all other motives in the lives of these and many other popes, seem to me to have blasted whatever of good intentions they possessed, and made their successful careers a curse of no common malignancy. Clerical supremacy seems to me a more abundantly fruitful source of evil than anything that can be named beside. I think that these two prelates were the chief demiurges of the evil creation that ensued. It took Christendom ages of suffering to break the degrading and depressing chains that they laid on it, and to emerge into that balanced liberty held in common by clerical and lay persons, which proves to be the only source of real reform. Itself the child of light, it protects and spreads light; and we now live by that light which with the greatest difficulty at length shot through the accumulated darkness. Innocent's six books in 120 of Migne's long columns will, I should think, sicken any one of carrying sacramental symbolism beyond the limits prescribed by Christ and Paul. I might give a

few specimens. Yet from the adjoining and equally corrupt Canon of the Mass how much of the beautiful and pure eloquence of our Communion-service is taken! There is more than I have space to transcribe. Our Reformers' eyes darted upon the true gold amidst the tinsel of corruption, and wisely have they rescued it for our use.

Of the three first Innocents the first in 402 saw Rome the prey of the barbarians, and its heathen temples reopening; and he died in fifteen years. The second, as we have seen, had Anacletus for a rival in the twelfth century; but lived to see his power paramount—1000 bishops gathered at Rome, and Lothaire suing to be crowned there by his hand: so that he was able to assert that all church-preferments were held in fee from him: and he found great support in Bernard of Clairvaux. And now of this Innocent—the third. He was son of Count Trasimund of Anagni, from which town the second Benedict also sprang. He was appointed fifty-five years after the death of the second Innocent, *i.e.* in 1198, just on the border of the thirteenth century, and he succeeded Celestine II. His struggle with Philip Augustus and his excommunication of John of England (and we have never had a second king of that name) seem doubtful matters and pale cruelties compared with the way in which for years he relentlessly harried Raymond of Toulouse. Yet he became lord of all kings: Italy saw him spread his rule from her western to her eastern sea: and with secular and clerical powers at his feet he held the fourth council at his Lateran palace in 1215, and put the stamp of Roman authority on the wildest of religious dreams, and called it Transubstantiation—the hardest of all corrupt dogmas to be philosophically stated and defended: a work in which the Council of Trent too was philosophically to fail. He also gave their *carte blanche* to both the Franciscan and Dominican orders. He died at Perouse one year after the Lateran council.

*From the Order of the Mass.*

P. 763. “‘The Lord be with you.’ ‘And with thy spirit.’ John vi. ‘Gloria be to Thee, O Lord.’ The priest kisses the

---

*Ordo Missæ, Opera, Migne, Vol. IV. p. 763.*

Dominus vobiscum. Et cum spiritu tuo. Seq. S. Evang. secundum Johannem vi. Gloria tibi, Domine... Sacerdos osculatur evangelium.

Gospel. 'May our faults be blotted out by the evangelic sayings.' Then, at the middle of the altar, the Nicene Creed... Offering the host upon a paten, 'Receive, holy Father, this immaculate host, which I Thine unworthy servant offer to Thee my living and true God for my innumerable sins and offences and my neglects and for all that are standing around and for all faithful Christians living and dead, that it may profit me and them to salvation unto eternal life, Amen.' Bending to the midst of the altar, 'Receive, O holy Trinity, the oblation of bread, which we offer to Thee for the memory of the passion, rising again, and ascension of Jesus Christ our Lord... and in honour of Mary ever-virgin and blessed John the Baptist the holy apostles Peter and Paul and those and all saints, that it may be profitable to them for their honour, but to us for our salvation, that they may deign to intercede for us in Heaven, whose memory we promote on earth, through the same Christ our Lord.' Turning towards the people, 'Pray, brethren, that this sacrifice from me and you may become acceptable to God the almighty Father.'

Ministrants. 'May God receive this sacrifice, &c.'

Priest. 'The Lord be with you.'

Ministrants. 'And with thy spirit.'

Priest. '(Lift) upwards (your) hearts.'

Ministrants. 'We have them (lifted up) to the Lord.'

Priest. 'Let us give thanks to our Lord.'

Ministrants. 'It is worthy and right.'

Per evangelica dicta deleantur nostra delicta. Deinde, ad medium altaris, Nicæn. symbol... Offerens hostiam super patenam, Suscipe, sancte Pater, hanc immaculatam hostiam quam ego indignus famulus tuus offero tibi Deo meo vivo et vero pro innumerabilibus peccatis meis et offensionibus et negligentis meis et pro omnibus circumstantibus et pro omnibus fidelibus Christianis vivis atque defunctis, ut mihi et illis proficiat ad salutem in vitam æternam. Amen... Inclinator ad medium altaris, Suscipe, sancta Trinitas, panis oblationem, quam Tibi offerimus ob memoriam passionis resurrectionis et ascensionis Jeau Christi Domini nostri—et in honore Mariæ semper virginis et beati Johannis Baptistæ et sanctorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli et istorum et omnium sanctorum, ut illis proficiat ad honorem, nobis autem ad salutem, ut illi pro nobis intercedere dignentur in cælis, quorum memoriam agimus in terris. Per eundem Christum Dominum nostrum... Versus ad populum, Orate, fratres, ut meum et vestrum sacrificium acceptabile fiat apud Deum Patrem omnipotentem.

Ministri. Suscipiat Deus hoc sacrificium, &c.

Sacerdos. Dominus vobiscum.

Ministri. Et cum spiritu tuo.

Sacerdos. Sursum corda.

Ministri. Habemus ad Dominum.

Sacerdos. Gratias agamus Domino nostro.

Ministri. Dignum et justum est.

Priest. 'It is truly worthy and just and right and healthful that we should always and everywhere give thanks, &c., and therefore with angels and archangels, &c., saying Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Sabaoth. The heavens and earth are filled with Thy glory. Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord. Hosanna in the highest.'

Then the Canon of the Mass. The following are taken from it.

'Which oblation do Thou, O God, deign, we beseech Thee, to make in all things blessed, dedicated, fixed, reasonable, and acceptable, that it may be made to us the body and blood of Thy most beloved Son our Lord Jesus Christ... We offer to Thy Renowned Majesty of Thy gifts given (to us, qy. by the people) a pure host, a holy host, an immaculate host, holy bread of eternal life and cup of perpetual salvation.' Striking his breast three times, 'Lord, I am not worthy that Thou shouldst come under my roof, &c.' He reverently takes the host, 'May the body of our Lord Jesus Christ keep my soul unto eternal life. Amen,' &c., &c.

Taking ablutions (water for washing), 'What we may take with the mouth,' &c.

*From the six books on the sacred mystery of the altar.*

P. 910. "Of the washing of the hands after the taking of the eucharist. After the sacrifice of the eucharist has been taken, the priest washes and pours water over his hands, that nothing may remain from having touched the most Divine sacrament, not that

Sacerdos. Vere dignum et justum est æquum et salutare nos tibi semper et ubique gratias agere, &c. &c. Et ideo cum angelis et archangelis, &c. dicentes Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus, Dominus Deus Sabaoth. Pleni sunt cœli et terra gloria tua. Benedictus qui venit in nomen Domini. Hosanna in excelsis.

Then the Canon of the Mass, p. 769. Some sentences are, Quam oblationem Tu, Deus, in omnibus, quesumus, benedictam ascriptam ratam rationabilem acceptabilemque facere digneris ut nobis corpus et sanguis fiat dilectissimi Filii Tui Domini nostri Jesu Christi, &c. ... offerimus præclaræ Majestati Tux de Tuis donis datis hostiam puram, hostiam sanctam, hostiam immaculatam, panem sanctum vitæ æternæ et calicem salutis perpetuæ... Percutiens pectus dicit ter, Domine non sum dignus ut intres sub tectum meum, &c. Sumit reverenter hostiam, Corpus Domini nostri Jesu Christi custodiat animam meam in vitam æternam. Amen, &c.

Sumens ablutiones, Quod ore sumamus, &c.

*De sacro altaris mysterio, libri sex. Lib. VI. c. VIII. p. 910.*

De ablutione manuum post eucharistiæ sumptionem. Post sumptum eucharistiæ sacrificium sacerdos abluit et perfundit manus, ne quid incaute remaneat ex contactu Divinissimi sacramenti, non quod quid

he has contracted any uncleanness from touching it, but rather to commemorate its dignity, &c. Luke xvii. It is indeed unworthy that the hands which have handled the incorruptible body should touch corruptible body until they be carefully washed, &c. ... But the ablution of the priest is done thrice: the ablution which takes place at the beginning, in the middle, at the end, marks the cleansing of the thought, speech and action, or the purging (away) of original sin, criminal sin and venial sin: or that which is done of ignorance or of negligence or of purpose, unto the cleansing away of which the salutary [or saving] sacrifice is offered.

P. 907. "Then the priest breaks the host into three parts, and two being reserved away from the cup, with the other he thrice makes the sign of the cross upon the cup, from whose mouth the deacon removes the corporal, and speaking with a loud voice, 'The 'peace of the Lord be with you always,' he puts down the portion of the host into the cup. The priest therefore breaks the host, that in the breaking of the bread we may know the Lord, Luke xxiv. The sign of the cross is thrice made with the host over the cup, because the virtue of the Trinity brings back the soul of the Crucified to (His) flesh that ... He may not give His flesh to see corruption, Ps. xv. (xvi.). Three crosses are therefore made with the host over the mouth of the cup, because three women were seeking the Crucified at the gate of the tomb, Luke xxiv. Therefore the cup's mouth here signifies the tomb's gate, and from the cup the deacon removes the corporal, designating that the angel of the Lord rolled back the stone from the gate of the tomb, &c.

---

immundum ex contactu sacramenti contraxerit, sed ut suam potius indignitatem commemoret, &c. Luc. xvii. Indignum quidem ... ut manus, quæ *corpus incorruptibile tractaverunt*, corpus corruptibile contingant, donec studiose laventur, &c. Trina vero sacerdotis ablutio, quæ fit in principio, in medio, in fine, designat mundationem cogitationis, locutionis, et actionis; vel purgationem originalis peccati, criminalis et venialis. Sive quod igitur per ignorantiam, negligentiam et industriam, ad quorum emundationem offertur sacrificium salutare.

L. VI., c. II. p. 907.

Tunc sacerdos frangit hostiam in tres partes; et, duabus extra calicem reservatis, cum aliâ signum crucis ter efficit supra calicem, de cujus ore diaconus removet corporale, et alta voce dicendo, "Pax Domini sit semper vobiscum," particulam hostiæ dimittit in calicem. Frangit igitur sacerdos hostiam ut in fractione panis Dominum cognoscamus, &c., Luc. xxiv.... Ter signum crucis producit cum hostiâ super calicem, quia virtus Trinitatis animam crucifixi (Christi) reducit ad carnem, ne...daret carnem Ejus videre corruptionem, Ps. xv. (xvi.). Ideo tres cruces fiunt cum hostia super os calicis quia tres mulieres quærebant crucifixum ad ostium monumenti, Luc. xxiv. Os ergo calicis in hoc loco significat ostium monumenti, de quo diaconus removet corporale, designans quod angelus Domini revolvit lapidem ab ostio monumenti, &c.

"*Of the rending of the veil.* The corporal is removed from above the cup because the veil of the temple was rent.

"*On the burial of Christ and the lifting up of the sacrifice.* Then the deacon approaches and lifts up the sacrifice a little from the altar, and both he and the priest let it down, because Joseph of Arimathæa came and buried Him; and because he rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulchre the deacon replaces the corporal on the cup's mouth.

"*Whether Christ at rising again received back the blood which He shed on the cross? ...* If ... a hair does not perish from your head, how much more does not that blood perish, which was of the truth of His nature, &c.

"*Whether wine without water is turned into blood.*

"*Of the mode of transubstantiation.* Augustine hands down that before consecration it is bread and wine which nature formed, but after consecration (it is) flesh and blood, because benediction has consecrated it: and Ambrose, &c., Thus the bread is annihilated, therefore it neither becomes the body of Christ nor anything. Thus the bread is not to be said to be incarnate, because the bread is made flesh, &c.

*L. V. c. XI. De scissione veli.*

Corporale desuper calicem removetur quia velum templi scissum est, Matt. xxvi.

*C. XII. De sepulturâ Christi et sacrificii exaltatione.*

Tunc accedit diaconus et exaltat aliquantulum sacrificium de altari, quod tam ipse quam sacerdos deponit, quia venit Joseph de Arimathea venit et Nicodemus et...sepelierunt. Et quia ille advolvit saxum magnum ad ostium monumenti diaconus super os calicis corporale reponit.

*L. IV. c. XXX.*

*Utrum Christus resurgens sanguinem resumpsit, quem effudit in cruce...Si...capillus de capite vestro non perit, quanto magis sanguis ille non perit qui fuit de veritate naturæ, &c.*

*C. XXXIX.*

*Utrum vinum sine aqua convertitur in sanguinem.*

*C. XX.*

*De modo transubstantiationis.* Tradit...Augustinus ante consecrationem panem esse et vinum quod natura formavit, post consecrationem vero carnem et sanguinem quod benedictio consecravit. Et Ambrosius, &c...ita panis annihilatur, ergo nec fit corpus Christi nec aliud, &c. non...ita panis dicendus est incarnari, quia panis fit caro, &c.

"Of corporals, and why one part is extended and the other is folded up... The part extended signifies faith; the folded part signifies the understanding.

"Why the gospel is read towards the north.

"Why the deacon who is to read the gospel kisses the bishop's [lit. pontiff's] right hand... 'His right hand shall embrace me,' Canticles viii.

"Of the two deacons who lead the bishop. They designate Abraham and David.

"Of the four principal colours, with which according to the properties of the days the robes are to be distinguished.

"Of the robes legal in tropology. Of the coverings for the loins... His hands and feet first washed (the priest of Israel) used to put on the coverings for the loins... figuring that he ought to take to himself continence. But our bishop, because he ought continually to have continence, does not put on vests for the loins in the sacrifice, but sandals, John xxi.... Of the robes of the priest of the gospel... Of the alb. A linen vestment (most widely different from coats of skins with the wool on... by which Adam, &c.) signifies newness of life... Of the stole. It falls above

#### L. II. c. LVI.

*De corporalibus et quare una pars extenditur, altera complicatur*... Pars extensa signat fidem; pars plicata signat intellectum, &c.

#### C. XLIII.

*Quare versus aquilonem legitur evangelium.*

#### C. XXXVI.

*Quare diaconus, qui lecturus est evangelium, dextram pontificis osculatur...* "Dextra illius amplexabitur me," Cant. viii.

#### C. VI.

*De duobus diaconis qui ducunt pontificem.* Designant Abraham et David, &c.

#### L. I. c. LXV.

*De quatuor coloribus principalibus, quibus secundum proprietates dierum vestes sunt distinguendæ.*

#### L. I. c. XIII.

*De vestibus legalibus secundum tropologiam.* De femoralibus... Lotis prius manibus et pedibus (sacerdos Israeliticus) induebat... femoralia...figurans quod debet assumere continentiam. Noster autem pontifex quia jugem habere debet continentiam non induit in sacrificio femoralia sed sandalia, John xxi. [C. 33.] De vestibus evangelici sacerdotis. [C. 36.] De albâ. Lineum vestimentum longissime distans a tunicis pelliceis...quibus Adam, &c. novitatem vitæ significat,

the clothing on the neck of the priest, and signifies obedience and servitude ... Of the Dalmatica. In form it signifies Christ's wide and large compassion.

P. 914. "Conclusion. Let none when he shall have heard this exposition consider that this sacrifice has been sufficiently expounded. So many and great mysteries have been involved in it that no-one, unless fully taught by (Divine) unction, can suffice to unfold them ... 'The close investigator into greatness will be 'oppressed by the glory,' Prov. xxv."

&c. [C. 38.] De Stola. Super amictum collo sacerdotis incumbit... obedientiam et servitutem significat, &c. [C. 40.] De Dalmaticâ. Formâ latam et largam misericordiam Christi significat, &c. &c.

P. 914.

Conclusio. Nemo, cum expositionem istam audierit, hoc sacrificium sufficienter æstimet expositum... Tot et tanta sunt involuta mysteria, ut nemo, nisi per unctionem edoctus, ea sufficiat explicare... Perscrutator majestatis opprimetur a gloria, Prov. xxv.

(O.) THE SERMO DE CÆNA DOMINI. A.D. 1154.

This is one of twelve treatises or papers, which in a Leyden edition of Cyprian of 1555, as well as doubtless in many other editions, are printed as Cyprian's writing; and indeed Pope Cornelius and Novatus are both mentioned in the treatises as contemporaries. Nevertheless the internal evidence against this supposition is so strong, that in modern editions of Cyprian they have ceased to be mentioned at all. In the book of Dr James the first keeper of the Bodleian Library at Oxford, very early in the seventeenth century, "On the corruption of the fathers," passages are cited, in which Bellarmine and Baronius do indeed renounce Cyprian's authorship for these treatises, but cling to the idea that they were written at a very ancient date. I have verified the former, and there is but one slight error. My Baronius does not answer to the references: but Dr James, supported by Stillingfleet, IV. 545, inclines to place these treatises in the twelfth century, i.e. nine hundred years later than Cyprian. It is well to notice that "sermo" in Horace is used for a treatise at least once, if not twice.

This treatise on the Lord's supper has received particular notice in various publications since the Reformation—much more, as it



would seem, than the real date of its production at all justifies. Nevertheless the chief passage here cited is interesting, at whatever date it was written. But if it be allowed that the style is unquestionably exceedingly unlike Cyprian, and that it teems with indications of a much later age, we are constrained to assign it to the list of those fraudulent productions, by which certain writers of later ages strove to invest their own favourite doctrines with whatever of reverence and authority was in their time conceded to the fathers of the early ages. Thus even the bright and learned spirit of this production tells against its authenticity, and helps to consign it to that division of Dr James' book which he broadly entitles, "Bastardy of the False Fathers." The title of the twelve treatises is, "De cardinalibus operibus Christi usque ad Ejus ascensionem ad Patrem; ad divum Cornelium papam."

P. 314. "Jesus therefore, when He was to put an end to the ceremonies of the law, willed that the passover should be prepared, and that those things, which according to the legal custom the solemnity required, should be sought and provided, viz. a lamb roasted, unleavened bread and wild endive. Therefore when the supper was laid out, the old and the new institutions met in this sacramental feast, and when the lamb had been eaten as required by ancient tradition, the Master sets before His disciples incorruptible food, nor are the nations now invited to feasts prepared with great expense and skill; but immortal nourishment differing from common food is given—retaining indeed the appearance of bodily substance, but proving by the invisible efficiency of a Divine virtue that His presence is there. Sacraments signified of old from the time of Melchizedek are now brought forward; and the High Priest brings forth to the sons of Abraham that do His works bread and wine. 'This,' saith He, 'is My body.' They had eaten

---

*Sermo de Cœna Domini. Cypriani Op. Lugduni, 1558, p. 314.*

Finem igitur legalibus cæremoniis impositurus, parari voluit pascha, et ex consuetudine legis ea quæri, quæ sollemnitas exigebat; agnum assum, panes azymos, lactucas agrestes...Cœnâ itaque dispositâ, inter sacramentales epulas obviarunt sibi instituta antiqua et nova; et consumpto agno, quem antiqua traditio proponebat, inconsumptibilem cibum Magister apponit discipulis; nec jam ad elaborata impensis et arte convivia populi invitantur, sed immortalitatis alimonia datur, a communibus cibis differens—corporalis substantiæ retinens speciem sed virtutis Divinæ invisibili efficientiâ probans adesse præsentiam. Significata olim a tempore Melchizedech prodeunt sacramenta, et filiis Abrahæ facientibus opera ejus Summus Sacerdos profert panem et vinum. "Hoc est," inquit, "corpus Meum." Manducaverant et biberant de

and drunk of the same bread according to the visible form ; but before those words that food was only common food, fit to nourish the body, and it did minister the support of bodily life. But from the time that it was said by the Lord, 'Do this in remembrance of Me ; this is My flesh, and this is My blood,' (as often as it was done with these words and this faith,) this substantial bread and the cup consecrated by solemn benediction, are profitable to the life and salvation of the whole man, being at the same time a medicine and a whole burnt-offering, for the curing of infirmities and for the purging away of iniquities. Moreover the difference between spiritual and bodily food has been made manifest : that what was first set before them and consumed was one thing, that what was given and distributed by the Master was another. As long as that food (plural), which had been made ready for that day, was being consumed by the apostles according to the custom, a memory of the old passover was being celebrated ; nor was Judas yet, though belonging to the old (Jewish) life, compelled to go out, though the devil was going into and taking possession of his mind : but when his traitorous mind received the touch of the sacred food, and the consecrated bread entered his wicked mouth, his parricidal mind was unable to bear the force of so great a sacrament, and he was blown out like chaff from the threshing floor, and ran headlong to perdition and the price (of blood), to despair and the cord. There had arisen at a certain time, as we read in St John's Gospel, a questioning concerning the following new saying, and the hearers had been amazed at the mystery of this doctrine, 'Unless ye shall have eaten the Son of Man's flesh and drunk His blood,

eodem pane secundum formam visibilem ; sed ante verba illa cibus ille communis tantum nutriendo corpori commodus erat, et vitæ corporalis subsidium ministrabat. Sed ex quo a Domino dictum est, "Hoc facite in Meam commemorationem ; hæc est caro Mea, et hic "est sanguis Meus"—quotiescunque his verbis et hac fide actum est—panis iste substantialis, et calix benedictione solemnæ sacrat, ad totius hominis vitam salutemque proficit, simul medicamentum et holocaustum ad sanandas infirmitates et purgandas iniquitates existens. Manifestata est etiam spiritualis et corporalis cibi distantia ; aliud fuisse quod prius est appositum et consumptum, aliud quod a Magistro datum est et distributum. Quamdiu cibi illi, qui ad diem festum erant parati a consuescentibus apostolis sumebantur, veteris paschæ agebatur memoria : necdum Judas, ad veterem vitam pertinens, diabolo invadente et occupante mentem ejus, egredi cogebatur ; sed ubi sacrum cibum mens perfida tetigit, et aceleratum os panis sanctificatus intravit, parricidalis animus vim tanti sacramenti non sustinens, quasi palea de aræ exsufflatus est, et præceps cucurrit ad proditionem et pretium, ad desperationem et laqueum. Orta fuerat aliquando, sicut in Evangelio Johannis legitur, de novitate hujus verbi quaestio, et ad doctrinæ hujus mysterium obstupuerant auditores, "Nisi manducaveritis carnem Filii Hominis et hiberitis Ejus

'ye will not have life in you.' And some, because they did not believe or understand this, went away back, because it seemed to them horrible and wicked to feed on human flesh—thinking this to be said in such a way that they were taught to eat His flesh, either boiled or roast, and cut to pieces limb by limb, when this personal flesh, were it portioned out into fragments, could not be enough for the whole human race, and if it had once been consumed, that religion would seem to have perished; since in no way could there be a victim any more. But in thoughts of the following kind, 'Flesh and blood profit not at all,' since as the Master Himself explained, 'These words are spirit and life,' nor can carnal sense penetrate to the understanding of so profound a meaning, unless faith be added—the bread is food, the blood is life, the flesh is substance, the body is the church ... He at one time calls (this) sacrament His own body, at another flesh and blood, at another bread, a portion of eternal life, of which according to these visible signs He gave to our bodily nature to partake. That common bread, changed into flesh and blood, procures for our bodies life and increment; and therefore, according to the customary effect of things, the infirmity of our faith, assisted by a sensible proof, has been brought to the opinion that the effect of eternal life is in the visible sacraments (signs), and that we are united to Christ not so much by a bodily as by a spiritual transition. For He Himself, both bread and flesh and blood, has Himself been made the meat and substance and life of His own church, which He calls His own body, giving to it to partake (of Him). And we indeed, since we

---

"sanguinem non habebitis vitam in vobis." Quod quidam, quia non credebant nec poterant intelligere, abierunt retro, quia horrendum eis et nefarium videbatur vesci carne humanâ—existimantes hoc eo modo dici, ut carnem Ejus, vel elixam vel assam, sectamque membratim edere docerentur, cum Illius Personæ caro, si in frusta partiretur, non omni humano generi posset sufficere; quâ semel consumptâ, videretur interire religio, cui nequâquam ulterius victima superesset. Sed in cogitationibus hujusmodi "Caro et sanguis non prodest quicquam," quia, sicut Ipse Magister exposuit, "verba hæc spiritus et vita sunt," nec carnalis sensus ad intellectum tantæ profunditatis penetrat, nisi fides accedat—panis est esca, sanguis vita, caro substantia, corpus ecclesia... Hoc sacramentum aliquando corpus Suum, aliquando carnem et sanguinem, aliquando panem Christus appellat portionem vitæ æternæ, cujus secundum hæc visibilia corporali communicavit naturæ. Panis iste communis in carnem et sanguinem mutatus procurat vitam et incrementum corporibus; ideoque, ex consuetudo rerum effectum, fidei nostræ adjuta infirmitas sensibili argumento edocta est visibilibus sacramentis inesse vitæ æternæ effectum, et non tam corporali quam spirituali transitione Christo nos uniri. Ipse enim, et panis et caro et sanguis, Idem cibus et substantia et vita factus est ecclesiæ Suæ, quam corpus Suum appellat, dans ei participationem. Et nos quidem, cum

were flesh and blood, a corrupt and weak nature of body and soul, could not be formed again or return to God's likeness, unless there were put on our inveterate disease a suitable sedative (lit. a poultice); and in the curing of our desperate infirmity, contraries were removed by contraries, and like were associated with like. That bread, which our Lord was handing to His disciples, changed not in resemblance but in nature, was by the almighty power of the Word made flesh, &c., &c.

P. 318. "The doctrine of this sacrament is new; and the authorities of the Gospel-school first put this forth, and out of Christ's teaching this doctrine first became well known, that Christians were to drink blood, the eating of which the authority of the old law most straitly forbids." [The consummate art of this writer's exposition of transubstantiation may well attract attention. It seems clever enough for Gerson and for Gerson's age.]

caro essemus et sanguis, corrupta et infirma corporis animæque natura, reformari non poteramus neque ad similitudinem Dei reverti, nisi morbo inveterato imponeretur malagma conveniens, et in curatione desperatæ infirmitatis contraria removerentur contrariis et similia similibus convenirent. Panis iste, quem Dominus discipulis porrigebat, non effigie sed naturâ mutatus, omnipotentia Verbi factus est caro, &c. &c. [This passage is labelled at the side "Transubstantiatio," and surely truly so.]

P. 318.

Nova est hujus sacramenti doctrina; et scholæ Evangelicæ hoc primum magisterium protulerunt; et doctore Christo primum hæc innotuit disciplina ut biberent sanguinem Christiani, cujus esum legis antiquæ auctoritæ distinctissime interdicat. [See also a remarkable passage, p. 322.]

## THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY.

- (A.) THE NOTED DECREE OF THE FOURTH COUNCIL OF THE LATERAN, in which "the name and thing" of transubstantiation were expressly adopted by the general Western church.  
A.D. 1215.

P. 1295. "But the universal church of the faithful [*i.e.* the external church in catholic union] is one, outside which there is no salvation. And in this Jesus Christ is the same Himself priest and sacrifice : and His body and blood are truly contained under the appearance of bread and wine in the sacrament of the altar, [the bread and wine] being transubstantiated, the bread into body, the wine into blood, by the Divine power, in order that to complete the mystery of unity we may ourselves receive from what is His own that which He received from what is ours, [*i.e.* body and blood]. And also no one can fulfil or 'make' this sacrament but a priest, who shall have been rightly ordained according to the keys of the church which Jesus Christ Himself gave up to the apostles and their successors."

This short decree stereotyped what had so long been floating in the Western churches, and made a formal rupture of the church indispensable, unless by a general council these unscriptural positions were as formally renounced : a thing which has not yet been

---

*The fourth Council of the Lateran, A.D. 1215, from the Delectus Actorum Eccl. Univ. seu Nova summa. Leyden, 1706. Capitulum I., Par. III., p. 1295.*

Una vero est fidelium universalis ecclesia, extra quam nullus omnino salvatur. In quâ idem Ipse sacerdos et sacrificium Jesus Christus : cujus corpus et sanguis in sacramento altaris sub speciebus panis et vini veraciter continentur, transubstantiatis pane in corpus et vino in sanguinem, potestate Divinâ, ut ad perficiendum mysterium unitatis accipiamus ipsi de Suo quod accepit Ipse de nostro. Et hoc utique sacramentum nemo potest conficere nisi sacerdos, qui fuerit rite ordinatus secundum claves ecclesie, quas Ipse concessit apostolis et eorum successoribus Jesus Christus.

even proposed. On the contrary the only effort has been (1) to perfect the theory adopted in the Trent council, and (2) to make it reasonable and self-consistent by individual expositions, first authoritatively by Pope Pius IV. in his Catechism, and afterward by unauthorized divines, among whom the palm has ever been assigned to Bellarmine. And if he has not succeeded, who certainly has not scrupled to avail himself of any possible cover and plea, we may pretty safely assume that the corrupt doctrine of the Real Presence of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament never can be made to appear consistent at all points with itself, not to speak of its discordance with all the spirit of the Scriptures and of religion.

(B.) ST FRANCIS OF ASSISI. B. 1182. D. 1226.

This very remarkable man both ushered in and was contemporaneous with the great movement of Innocent III., which took shape in the Fourth Lateran Council of 1213. If that pope stands in a bad light as the authorizer of the thing and name transubstantiation: in this point St Francis went entirely with him. And if that pope has to be recognized as intending at first to be a reformer of morals, but that living in a superstitious age he took the road of superstition to reach that end, then in the matter of moral reform the clothier's son of Assisi was a grand fellow-worker with him. But in one point Francis was before the age, for he promoted no worship to any saint except the Virgin Mary. He held his first chapter of Friars (brethren) three years before the Lateran Council: but his great council of the straw-huts (*Store-arum*), near the Portiuncula, his own church, where 5,000 were present, none of whom, not one, had "a purse or a penny," was held six years after the council. St Dominic attended from Spain, to get ideas for his projected order. The historic evidence that goes to clear St Francis at the close of his life from all participation in the reported miraculous stigmata in his hands and feet and in the wound in his side is I think very strong: and the evidence points to his more worldly successor Elias as the propagator of a pure fiction. The saint himself shewed in all things such an amount of forecast in everything he said and did, that it redeems him from bearing the character of a *blind* enthusiast, but it casts upon him a very strong suspicion of design, almost deserving the

term of cunning, or to say the least, if I may coin a word, almost preternatural "kenning." He had a kind of instinct of what would turn out for the glory and stability of his order. But of this last crowning device he may be entirely guiltless. There is not space here for so long an argument. It is nearer to our purpose to intimate that in all his three Rules, (1) for Friars, (2) for sister Clares, (3) for members still living in the world, the Lord's supper, according to the Western mode of celebration, took a very conspicuous part. The three vows, poverty, celibacy, and perfect obedience to human authority, were to be supported by the usual daily communicating as far as possible. It is notable that he was also the morning star of poetry in the previously despised Florentine Italian, or Tuscan tongue.

St Francis was contemporary not with Innocent III. only, but with Philip Augustus of France, the grandfather of Louis IX. the one pious French king, rightly called St Louis, though weakened by superstitious excitement, and also with John of England. The Third Crusade was in his time. He took no part in it further than by making a most courageous attempt to attain its end by converting the Sultan Mahmoud himself in earnest personal interviews. He made no common impression upon the Sultan both by offering to peril his own life in fire, and by refusing his lavish offers of money, which was the Sultan's mode of expressing high admiration. The saint's faith doubtless embraced much that was wood, hay, stubble; but that there was something living and real I do not see how it is possible to doubt. Still it would be irrational not to deplore the bad and lasting consequences of the errors that were blended in abundance with his good in the "miry clay" so freely mingled with the certain amount of iron, in this idol of his own and many succeeding ages.

One thing is very worthy of attention in this extraordinary man, *viz.* the exactness with which he received and followed certain isolated scriptural sayings—not those of Jesus only. He must have been a close and patient meditator upon Scripture, and in some particulars was very obedient to it. What he suffered by the want of, was a comprehensive view of the whole New Testament system: for he built his entire edifice on a few individual sayings, *e.g.* he heard it read that Jesus said, "When I sent you forth without scrip or shoes, were ye in want of anything?" And they said "Of nothing." The picture of Franciscans with two articles

of clothing and a rope for a girdle is a curious literalization of this passage. But who dare to say that his movement was of no service to check transgression till the Reformation came? He is evidently in many points the model that was looked to by the other two St Francis's, *i.e.*, Francis Xavier and François de Sales, to say nothing of the Francesco de Pauli, who created the order of Minims to live on the least possible variety of food, denying them not meat only, but even fish.

His name, originally John, was changed to Francis on his learning French fluently, to speak to those whom trade brought to his father from that country. In a local struggle between his native town and Perouse he was taken captive and not released for a year. Some date his devotion to religious ideas to that calamity. There is a fable recorded by Baillet that he was born with the mark of a cross on his shoulder and in a stable: a tradition which seems worthy to take rank with the later account of his stigmata, inflicted as Bonaventure says, by a crucified seraph, whom he saw in his vision in Mount Apennine. He won such respect that the people of the towns rang the bells when he approached. His injunctions to his followers were to win the rich by humility and respect, and the poor by kind conversation and a spotless life. Hurter, who writes both of him and of Dominic in the German Dict. Encycl., reckons the influence of Francis on posterity more considerable than that of Dominic. The former is eminent for love, the latter left the character of severity to his followers. The world will not forget that in Toulouse and in Spain, the horrors of the Inquisition were transacted by Dominicans. Though Dominic was born in 1170, 12 years earlier, it was not till 1217 that he inaugurated his society of 16 members, but Francis inaugurated his corps of 11 members in 1211, and held his great council of 5,000 members, and had 500 postulants two years after Dominic's beginning. Dominic's followers maintained the Virgin's conception to be immaculate. Franciscans supplied a far larger number of leaders of thought in the scholastic period; but yet they maintained that the presence of Christ's body in the second sacrament was by continual fresh acts of creation, which their rivals denied, and triumphed over them on this question. Dominic had no love of poetry to make him tender. Nearly contemporary was St Elizabeth of Hungary. See besides other books, Pulszky's Traditions of Hungary.



His three bodies of Rules for the three different associations contain each many short chapters.

P. 27. 1. 1. c. 22. "Of the confession of brethren and their receiving the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. Let the blessed brethren, as well clergymen as laymen, confess their sins to the priests of our religion: and if they cannot (confess to them), let them do it to other discreet and catholic priests—knowing firmly and giving the mind to it that, from whatever priests they may have received penitence and absolution, they will without doubt be absolved from those sins, if they shall have carefully attended to the observing of the penitence (or penance) enjoined upon them with humility and fidelity. But if they then have been unable to have a priest let them confess to a brother of their own, as the apostle James says, 'Confess your sins to one another.' Yet let them not give up returning to the priests, because to the priests alone has been given the power of binding and loosing. And thus in contrition and having confessed let them receive the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ with great humility and veneration, attending to what the Lord Himself says, John vi. 56, 'He that eateth My flesh and drinketh my blood, &c.'; Luke xxii. 19, 'Do this in remembrance, &c.'

P. 7. "By the virtue of Christ's words the sacrament is accomplished ['made,' Jerome's word].

P. 10. "Let all clerical persons among us give attention to

*Works of St Francis. Augustæ, 1739, p. 27. Rule I. I. XXII. De confessione Fratrum et perceptione Corporis et Sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi.*

Fratres benedicti, tam clerici quam laici, confiteantur peccata sua sacerdotibus nostræ religionis. Et si non possunt, confiteantur aliis discretis et catholicis sacerdotibus—scientes firmiter et attendentes quod a quibuscunque sacerdotibus acceperint pœnitentiam et absolutionem, absoluti erunt proculdubio ab illis peccatis, si pœnitentiam sibi injunctam procuraverint humiliter et fideliter observare. Si vero tunc sacerdotem habere non potuerunt, confiteantur fratri suo, sicut dicit Apostolus Jacobus, Confitemini alterutrum peccata vestra. Non tamen ab hoc dimittant recurrere ad sacerdotes, quia potestas ligandi atque solvendi solis sacerdotibus est concessa. Et sic contriti atque confessi sumant corpus et sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi cum magnâ humilitate et veneratione, attendentes quod Ipse Dominus dicit, John vi. 56, Qui manducat, &c., et Luc. xxii. 19, Hoc facite, &c.

P. 7, Ep. XII.

Virtute verborum Christi altaris conficitur sacramentum.

P. 10.

Attendamus omnes clerici magnum peccatum et ignorantiam, quam

the great sin and ignorance in many persons regarding the most holy body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ and its most sacred names, and the words written, the utterance of which [by the priests] consecrates the body. We know that it cannot be the body unless it be first consecrated by the word. For we have and see nothing concerning the Highest One Himself in this age except the body and blood, and really the names and words by which we have been made and redeemed from death to life. For let all those, that administer such most holy mysteries, consider within themselves (chiefly those who administer indiscreetly) with what common cups, corporals, cloths, the body and blood of our Lord are sacrificed, and they are left in many common places, &c. Men ought to put them together in places of honour.

P. 12. "Words of sacred admonition to all His own brethren... All who saw the Lord Jesus according to the flesh and did not see nor believe that according to the Spirit and the Deity He is Himself the Son of God were condemned. So now also all who see the sacrament that is consecrated by the words of the Lord upon the altar by the hands of the priest in the form of bread and wine, and do not see and do not believe according to the Spirit and Divinity that it is truly the most holy body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, have been condemned, the Highest One Himself bearing witness, Luke xxii. 15, John vi. 54... Behold He daily humbles Himself, as when He came from His royal seats into the virgin's womb. Himself daily comes to us appearing in a

---

quidam habent super sanctissimum corpus et sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi, et sacratissima nomina, et verba Ejus scripta, quæ sanctificant corpus. Scimus quia non potest esse corpus nisi prius sanctificetur a verbo. Nihil habemus enim vel videmus corporaliter in hoc sæculo de Ipso Altissimo nisi corpus et sanguinem, et realiter nomina et verba per quæ facti sumus et redempti sumus de morte ad vitam. Omnes enim illi, qui ministrant tam sanctissima mysteria, considerent intra se (maxime hi qui indiscretè ministrant) quam viles sint calices corporalia lintamina ubi sacrificatur corpus et sanguis Domini nostri; et multis in locis vilibus relinquitur, &c. In loco honesto debent collocare.

P. 12.

Verba sacræ admonitionis ad omnes fratres suos... Omnes qui viderunt Dominum Jesum secundum humanitatem et non viderunt neque crediderunt secundum Spiritum et Deitatem Ipsum esse verum Filium Dei damnati sunt. Ita et modo (quia) omnes qui vident sacramentum quod sanctificatur per verba Domini super altare per manus sacerdotis in formâ panis et vini et non vident et non credunt, secundum Spiritum et Divinitatem, quod sit veraciter sanctissimum corpus et sanguis Domini nostri Jesu Christi, damnati sunt, Ipso Altissimo attestante, Luc. xxii. v. 15, Joan. vi. 54.... Ecce quotidie humiliat Se, sicut quando a regalibus sedibus venit in uterum Virginis: quotidie venit

humble guise; He daily comes down from the bosom of the Supreme Father upon the altar in the hands of the priest. And as he appeared to the holy apostles in true flesh, so now also He shews Himself to us in the sacred bread. And as the apostles themselves by looking at His flesh saw His flesh only, but believed Him to be the Lord God Himself, contemplating Him with their spiritual eyes, so let us also see the bread and wine with the eyes of the body and firmly believe it to be His most holy body and His living and true blood, Matt. xxvi.

P. 17. "Exposition on the Lord's Prayer. 'Our daily bread,' that is to say, Thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ. 'Give to us 'to-day,' for the remembrance and understanding and reverence of the love which He had towards us and of those things which for us He said and did and endured ...

P. 20. "Testament ... I wish to fear love and honour the priests themselves and all others as my lords: and I am unwilling to think of sin in them, because I see the Son of God in them and they are my lords. I do this for the reason that in this world I see nothing of a bodily nature of the Highest One Himself the Son of God but His most holy body and His own blood, which they themselves receive and themselves alone administer to others, &c."

As St Francis is no divine, but only a rapt and devotional meditator on the Scripture, it is not to be wondered that he implicitly received the teaching of the church in his day on the

ad nos Ipse humilis apparens: quotidie descendit de sinu Summi Patris super altare in manibus sacerdotis. Et sicut sanctis apostolis apparuit in verâ carne, ita et modo Se nobis ostendit in sacro pane. Et sicut ipsi intuitu carnis Sux tantum Ejus carnem videbant sed Ipsum Dominum Deum esse credebant, oculis spiritualibus contemplantes, sic et nos panem et vinum oculis corporeis videamus et credamus firmiter sanctissimum Ejus corpus esse et sanguinem vivum esse et verum, Matt. xxvi.

P. 17. *Expositio super Orat. Dom.*

"Panem nostrum quotidianum," scilicet dilectum Filium Tuum Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum. "Da nobis hodie," in memoriam et intelligentiam et reverentiam amoris, quem ad nos habuit, et eorum quæ pro nobis dixit et fecit et sustulit.

P. 20.

Testamentum...Sacerdotes ipsos et omnes alios volo timere amare et honorare sicut meos dominos. Et nolo in ipsis considerare peccatum, quia Filium Dei cerno in ipsis et domini mei sunt. Hæc propter hoc facio quia nihil video corporaliter in hoc sæculo de Ipso Altissimo Filio Dei nisi sanctissimum corpus et sanguinem Suum, quod ipsi recipiunt et ipsi soli aliis administrant, &c.

Lord's supper. There is also an instinctive prudence in him, which kept him from carrying his bold thoughts and resolves into things that popes and priests could not pardon. This Francis had three biographies, written by Thomas Colanus, Rufinus and two others, and St Buonaventura, 3, 20 and 37 years after his death respectively. Legends on legends have been since added. A tract is in circulation, "Fioretti di San Francisco," attributed to a date about 100 years after his death.

(C.) BENEDICTION OF THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT FOR THE TERTIARIES or Third Order of the Franciscans or Third Order of Penance. London, 1869.

From (1) the manual by Father Salvator d' Ozieri, Capuchin Father-General, (2) the congregation of Calais, (3) the (English) manual, (4) the secret constitutions, a single copy of which remains in the convent of the Ara Cœli at Rome.

"O salutary Host, which openest the gate of the sky, &c. Thou hast marked, O Lord, Thy servant Francis with the signs (the stigmata) of Thy redemption, &c., &c. 'Pange, lingua.' [Fourth and fifth verses.] The Word flesh by His word makes true bread flesh: and wine becomes the blood of Christ, but if our perception fails (to discern it) faith alone suffices to confirm the sincere heart. Let us then humbly (cernui) venerate so great a sacrament, and the ancient rule (documentum) give way to the new rite; let faith provide a supplement to the defect of the senses, &c." After Lord's Prayer, Ave, and Apostles' Creed, the form "I confess to God omnipotent, to blessed Mary ever virgin, to blessed Michael archangel, to blessed John Baptist, to the holy apostles Peter and Paul, to our blessed father Francis and to all saints and to thee, father, because I have sinned too much in thought, word and deed, through my fault, through my fault, through my very great fault. Therefore I pray blessed Mary ever virgin, blessed Michael archangel, blessed John Baptist, the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, our blessed father Francis, all saints, and thee, father, to pray for me to our Lord God.

"N.B. Pope Leo X. has granted to all persons, who are bound to say the Divine office, or that of the blessed virgin, the remission of all faults and frailties in the recitation of the said offices, provided they shall say these two prayers, devoutly kneeling, which were composed by St Buonaventura.

"Appendix. A rule has been drawn up at Ara Cœli for the use of the Tertiary Sisters in the Diocese of Westminster slightly

different from the one in this Manual. [It contains, vol. II. 39] The blessing of St Francis. 'May the Lord bless thee and guard thee. May He shew His own face to thee and pity thee: may He turn His own countenance to thee, and may He give peace to thee. May the Lord bless thee.' This blessing was given to Moses by Almighty God and by Christ Himself to our seraphical father St Francis. Those who carry it about with them with lively faith and devotion will receive many graces spiritual and temporal. It is a preservation in childbearing, thunder and lightning, sickness, sudden death, dangers at sea and in stratagems and temptations of the devil and many other dangers... At the Ara Coeli the scapulars given are three or four inches wide, with the arms of St Francis tacked on to the serge. To gain the indulgence for what are called the 'cross' prayers, *i.e.* those said with the arms extended in the shape of a cross, six paters and aves are now required instead of five.

Vol. I. p. 54. "Rule of the order. [Chap. 6.] All the brothers and sisters (of the order) must confess their sins and devoutly receive the holy eucharist at least three times a year, &c.

Vol. II. p. 363. "Form of absolution with plenary indulgence for the brothers and sisters of the cord (of St Francis) in the article of death."

All from Manual of the Third Order, 2 vols., Burns publisher. The parts in Latin are translated.

(D.) ROGER BACON, MONK OF ST. FRANCIS AT OXFORD.

B. 1214. D. 1294.

He was a pupil of Bishop Grosshead, "Robert of Lincoln." He studied at Oxford and Paris, and deserved and won the title of Doctor mirabilis. He afterwards lectured in Oxford and resided there. But he writes like a man with a sword hanging over his head, or rather, like a man executing a graceful dance in the midst of swords pointed upwards. He knows well his danger, and in spite of all his cautions and courtesies towards the pope he fell into what was formerly the usual receptacle of those who ventured to think in advance of their age—a prison. The Franciscan order is indebted to Britain both for him, and for Duns Scotus, and for Alexander Hales, and for William Occam. The only leading Franciscan philosopher not a Briton was John Buonaventura. Roger Bacon prepared the way for optical discoveries and advanced chemistry in his pursuit of the philosopher's stone. But the in-

vention of gunpowder is assigned to a Greek (see Dict. Universel). He followed Gerbert, Pope Sylvester, in the correction of the calendar. He is said to have spent above £2000—an enormous sum in those days—in experiments for the promotion of philosophy. The present age will revere him for having urged the study of the Scriptures in their original tongues and for having maintained that though faith precedes reason, yet reason performs essential service to faith, and that the one asks and receives aid from the other continually. He had the honour of being a material but not a materialist philosopher. He knew Greek and read Aristotle. What we long for is his last *Compendium Theologiæ*: and we wonder whose fault it is that it does not survive. I could not omit the curious only passage that I find in him on the Lord's supper in far Cathay.

P. 234. "On the countries of the world. But it is known that from the beginning of dark-skinned Cathaia to the termination of the East there are chiefly idolaters, but mingled among them Saracens and Tartars and Nestorians; which (last) are imperfect Christians, having a patriarch of their own in the East, that visits their regions, and ordains infants in their cradles to the sacred orders, because he is the only one to ordain; and he cannot come round to any one place again, say under fifty years: and he says that he has authority from the Roman church of old, and is ready to obey it, if there were a way of communication. And those priests teach the sons of the well-born Tartars the Gospel and the faith, and the rest as they are able. But the Tartars look down upon them, because they know little and are a people of bad morals. And the priests consecrate in the mass one broad loaf of the measure of one's hand; and they divide it first into twelve parts according to the number of the apostles, and afterwards they

---

*Opus Majus*, p. 234, *De regionibus mundi*. London, 1733.

Sciendum vero est quod a principio Cathaie nigre usque in finem Orientis sunt principaliter idololatræ, sed mixti sunt inter eos Saraceni et Tartari et Nestoriani, qui sunt Christiani imperfecti, habentes patriarcham suum in Oriente, qui visitat regiones, et ordinat infantes in cunabulis ad sacros ordines, quia ipse solus ordinat; et non potest venire ad unum locum nisi quasi in L. annis: et ille dicit se habere auctoritatem a Romanâ ecclesiâ ab antiquo, et paratus est obedire, si via esset aperta. Et isti docent filios nobilium Tartarorum evangelium et fidem, et alios quando possunt. Sed quia parum sciunt et sunt malorum morum, ideo Tartari despiciunt eos. Et consecrant in missâ unâ panem latum ad modum palmæ, et dividunt primo in XII. partes secundum numerum apostolorum, et postea illas partes dividunt secundum nume-

divide those parts according to the number of the people, and the priest gives the body of Christ to each in his hand; and then each one takes it from the palm of his own hand, doing reverence, &c., &c."

---

*rum populi, et sacerdos dat unicuique corpus Christi in manu suâ et tunc quilibet assumit de palmâ suâ cum reverentiâ, &c. &c.*

(E.) ALEXANDER OF HALES. FL. 1222. D. 1245.

This, the irrefragable doctor, stood between the two periods of scholasticism: uniting, as it were, Abailard and the St Victor school of the 12th century with Albertus and Aquinas and Duns Scotus of the 13th. His name shews him to be altogether an Englishman. Hales or Ales was born in Gloucestershire. He too was a Franciscan as well as his pupil Bonaventure, the Italian biographer of St Francis. Alexander Hales adopted the opinion of Concomitance, brought in by Robert Pulleyn, *viz.* that in whichever element the communion is received, the other element is spontaneously a concomitant, so that both are really received: and that in fact it is impossible to separate them in their reception by the communicant. This term would better have suited the particular interpretation of Melanchthon and his companions than Consubstantiation; because he wished to say that the believer received the real body of Christ, though it had not entered into the bread and wine on the table. Luther sometimes seemed to assert that Christ's body was in the elements on the table; for instance at Marburg. But concomitance, if it had been adopted by the Lutheran body, would have meant the receiving the natural body and blood as a concomitant to the bread and wine. Pulleyn, Hales, and others meant that one element became spontaneously concomitant on the reception of the other. The Melanchthonian term is particularly infelicitous because it implies that only the substance of Christ's body, detached from its sensible properties, is added to the bread and wine in or after the act of reception. But the general German belief was that the body and blood were received entire with the entire bread and wine: *i.e.* both substance and accidents in both cases, which it was most unfit to call consubstantiation.

Hales joined the new Franciscan company at the earnest solici-

tation of a Franciscan member, who wanted his name and fame to give weight to the order: and Hales was already Doctor in Theology, and up to this time the universities would not grant degrees to these orders; and they were forbidden by their own authorities to receive them. This was all changed by the authority of Innocent IV. in 1244. Hales was the first to use Aristotle and the Arabian commentator in theological encounters: but the philosopher of Stagira had found defenders in the council at Paris in 1210. Hales recognized and followed Anselm. But the great work of Hales is his commentary or Quæstiones on the four books of Peter Lombard. His disciples completed and published them in 1252, seven years after his death. Two German writers have given extracts from an earlier work upon Peter Lombard by Peter of Poitiers, which has never been printed: so that Hales is not the first in this line. He is deemed however to be utterly surpassed in it both by Aquinas and Bonaventure, as well as by Duns Scotus. Hales published other works: but it is difficult to settle which are his and which belong to others. Some that he wrote are lost, and others are supposed to be still in the recesses of libraries at Milan and Oxford. When we claim Hales as an Englishman, we ought to remember that his name and his birth are altogether such. He was an élève of the University of Paris, which then approached at last to an ecumenical character. Not Englishmen only, but Scotsmen went thither in abundance, and were as well received as if they had been Frenchmen.

P. 275. "Of the office of the mass. But it is called 'the office' as if it were the office from effecting (all this), one letter being changed to improve the beauty of the term. Or (if not this,) certainly that each priest may do those things, which may hurt none but profit all [singular word-play: but English has no word for an 'officiant's' *hurt* nearer than 'officious'], as Raban says. And as he also says, Office in kind, *i.e.* singular, though there be very many. The whole is called Missa (mass). And it is so called from the beginning unto the words, 'Go, it has been sent (missa)'... since an angel is sent to the offering up... and it is

---

P. 275. Part IV. Q. X. *De officio Missæ. Op. Colon.* 1622.

Officium autem dicitur quasi efficiū ab efficiendo dictum propter decorem sermonis unā mutatā literā. Vel certe ut quisque illa agat quæ nulli officiant sed prosint omnibus, sicut dicit Rabanus. Et ut idem dicit, officium genere, licet sunt plurima... Dicitur missa totum, quod dicitur ab introitu usque "Ite missa est"... quoniam angelus



called missa because they were then sent out from the church ... And this [the consecration, in its place in the mass] is said in great silence ... only those words by which the Lord's body is *made* [Jerome] ...

Art. III. "Whether there be truly in the sacrament a transmutation or conversion of the bread into the body of Christ, or the bread remain together with the body. Enquiry is thus made, and it is shewn that there is a conversion of the bread into the body of Christ, and that it does not remain together with that body ... Others, Damian in particular, say ... (that the bread) passes by a power beyond nature into Christ's body and blood. This is evident from the very form of the words ... Also if the substance of bread were in it together with the body, then as it is said by the (priest's) voice, 'This is My body,' and a consecration has been so made, it would also be true to say, This is material bread, which is false and heretical. If the substance of bread remained, then you would take Christ's body in the way of a sacred sign [lit. sacramentally] ... He had broken fast by taking it. On the contrary it would be a truer sign ... It would be more accordant that bread in its own substance should be a sign than that only the appearance of bread (without its substance should be) ... If there were only the appearance the senses would be erring and deceived. Touch and taste indicate that it is bread and not the appearance of it only, &c. Resolution of the difficulties. Bread in no wise remains, &c. It is contrary to the authority of the holy (fathers) that there is not some conversion. One reason is that idolatry is avoided [some words of the text may be wrong]. If bread remained perhaps it

---

mittitur... ad offertorium... et dicitur missa quia tunc emittebantur foris. 7. Quod sub silentio dicitur... solum illa verba quibus Dominicum corpus conficitur.

*Pars III. De officio Missæ, Art. III. § 1.*

An sacramento sit vero transmutatio sive conversio panis in corpus Christi, vel panis maneat simul cum corpore. Quæritur sic et ostenditur quod est conversio panis in Christi corpus et non simul manet cum corpore. Alii ... maxime Damianus ... supernaturaliter transit in corpus et sanguinem Christi... Hoc patet ex ipsâ formâ verborum, &c. Item si simul cum corpore esset substantia panis, sicut voce dicitur, Hoc est corpus Meum, factâ consecratione, et vere dicitur, Hic est panis materialis, *quod est falsum et hæreticum*. Si substantia panis maneret, tunc sumes corpus Christi sacramentaliter... Solverat jejunium sumendo. Contra verius esset signum... magis competeret quod panis in suâ substantiâ esset signum, quam quod sola species panis... Si esset sola species sensus errarent et deciperentur. Tactus et gustus indicant panem esse non solam speciem, &c. Resolutio, Panis nequaquam manet, &c. Contraria sanctorum auctoritati quod non est aliqua conversio. Una ratio est idololatria evitata. Si maneret panis, for-

would be adored with the Lord without distinction. It would first bring us to the understanding of the bread and afterwards to that of the Lord, in a direct way. A spiritual refreshment, spiritual altogether. Then the food would be carnal and not spiritual only. [This implies that the body and blood of the Lord in this sacrament are not carnal, *i.e.* not a real natural body and blood.] The truth insinuated is that we should believe that there is only food for the soul, a spiritual *not a bodily* communion. [Then Rome is wrong; but see Thirlwall.] It diminishes the usefulness of merit, because by laying down that accidents cannot exist without a subject, by leaning on human reasonings the merit of faith is diminished. Although then there would be a more determinate representation, there would not be so direct an inference [*viz.* as to our receiving Christ into us.] The inference is more necessary to us than the representation of Him. The judgment of the senses is not to be looked to in this sacrament, but rather the merit of faith ... But man by faith in this sacrament deserves (earns) more than if the accidents of bread had the subject (bread, in it too)... The conversion into Christ which there is, yet is not an increasing of anything, because the whole is by miracle converted into the whole. [What reasoning!] (The portion) is not converted into the whole, like meat into a thing fit to become food, nor is it united to it, but the whole is by Divine virtue converted into the whole.

P. 358. "Whether Christ, as far as He is contained in this sacrament, sits or stands or lies down. It seems necessarily to follow that He sits, as He does in Heaven." [I make no comment. The presumption is too great to speak about.]

---

tasse adoraretur indistincte cum Domino. Primo deduceret ad comprehensionem panis et post ad Domini, modo immediato. Spiritualis refectio spiritualis omnino. Tunc cibus carnalis et non solum spiritualis. Veritatis insinuatio ut credatur quod sit tantum cibus animæ—communio spiritualis non corporalis. Minuit utilitatem meriti, quia ponendo quod accidentia non possunt esse sine subjecto, innitendo rationibus humanis, meritum fidei imminuitur. Etsi expressior esset tunc representatio, non ita immediata esset deductio... deductio est magis necessaria quam representatio .. In hoc sacramento non est attendendum iudicium sensuum sed potius fidei meritum... Plus autem meretur homo fide huius sacramenti, quam si essent (accidentia) in subjecto... Conversio in Christum quod est, nec est augmentum alicujus, quia totum mirabiliter convertitur in totum... Non convertitur in totum sicut cibus in cibabile, nec ei unitur...sed virtute Divina totum convertitur in totum.

*Part IV. Q. X. Memb. VII. Art. III. § 7, p. 358.*

Utrum Christus secundum quod continetur in hoc sacramento sedeat vel stet vel jaceat. Videtur quod oportet e necessitate...sedere sicut est in cælo.

## (F.) CARDINAL JOHN FIDANZA, NAMED BUONAVENTURA.

B. 1221. D. 1274.

Of Tuscan origin, and reported to have had his life as a child given to him with his name at the prayer of Francis (of Assisi). We cannot wonder to find him in the Franciscan order. But at Paris at 22 he was under the tuition of the irrefragable doctor Alexander Hales (of England). At 34 he received the cap of a doctor at the same time as Thomas Aquinas. He had great influence in the family of the renowned French king St Louis; and drew up for him an Office of the Passover at his desire, also a body of rules for his sister Isabella to use in the nunnery at Longchamps. At the age of 35 he was chosen general of the order of the Franciscans. At 44 Pope Gregory X. made him cardinal and bishop of Albano. He attended at one of the general councils held at Lyons (Thomas Aquinas having been taken away by death), when there was a hope of drawing over the Greek church. He died as he had lived, noted for his peculiar turn of mental devotion, gazing on a crucifix. Nine years earlier he refused the archbishopric of York. In Lyons and in all Burgundy he was long remembered.

It is singular that Bonaventure sat in the seat of La Rochelle, his tutor in Paris, on the part of the Franciscans, on the same day that the Dominican Thomas Aquinas delivered his first lecture in the same city: but perhaps when the one order brought forth its man of promise the other was stimulated to do the same. Bonaventure in a perilous sickness at four years of age, in 1225, was specially commended by his mother to the tutelage of St Francis of Assisi. He recovered, and the maternal vow was kept by her zealous son, though he did not enter the order till he was 22 years of age, seventeen years after St Francis' death.

It has been remarked that hardly had the two rival orders fairly established themselves, when scholasticism seemed to come forth afresh, armed with new weapons of power. Perhaps we may give the two orders the credit of giving a new impulse to the discussions of the Sorbonne doctors. Henceforth they could not sleep in their chairs. William of Saint Amour of the Sorbonne opposed both orders: but the pope had his books burned. And the gentle and learned Bonaventure was made general of his order at 34, on the resignation of the severe John of Parma.

Luke XXII. "He afterwards treated of the eating of the pass-over. Here he secondly treats of the institution of the eucharist, about which three things are grouped; that is the consecration of the Lord's body, the conferring of the power, and the consecration of Christ's blood ... He instituted the form of consecration (to be) in these words, 'This is My body.' But note that there are four opinions; (1) that He accomplished it by the power of the God-head without words, and after the words He spake and gave virtue to the words, (2) that He first said the words in secret, and afterwards openly, (3) that He said the words only once, but first brake the bread and afterwards accomplished the change, (4) that He spoke the words once, and by speaking accomplished it, and by accomplishing it instituted (the four) and spake it before He brake it. Therefore the letter puts the last first and ought to be arranged together thus: 'He took bread and gave thanks, saying, This is My body, and brake and gave it.' ... For thus Melchizedek blessed, as Christ also did, and much more copiously, because He is an eternal priest, Ps. cix. (cx.). Thus came the gloss, 'By His word alone He converted bread into His own body.' Therefore this is the sense of the word 'This is My body,' i.e. marked by this to be converted into My body: is My body. [Qy. The word He uttered signifies that this is to come to pass. If so, what is gained by this *longa ambages*, which adds no fresh idea?] Or this is passing into My body which is whole and perfect. But there is efficacy in the word that this should be done by its being said ... But in the receiving of the bread is understood the taking of flesh (by Him), because it is said, 'My flesh is truly food.' He received bread to mark that word, 'The Word was made flesh.' In the

---

II. *Luce XXII. Moguntia, 1609.*

Postquam egit de manducatione phase; hic secundo agit de institutione eucharistiae, circa quam inducuntur tria, scilicet consecratio Dominici corporis, collatio potestatis, et consecratio Christi sanguinis... (1) Formam consecrandi instituit in his verbis, Hoc est corpus Meum. Sed nota quod quatuor sunt opiniones: (1) Quod confecit virtute Divinitatis sine verbis: et post verba dixit et virtutem dedit verbis, (2) Quod prius verba dixit in occulto et post in manifesto, (3) Quod semel tantum verba dixit, sed prius fregit et post confecit, (4) Quod semel verba dixit et dicendo confecit, et conficiendo instituit et prius dixit quam fregit. Unde litera præpostera est, et debet construi sic; accepit panem et gratias egit, dicens, Hoc est corpus Meum, et fregit et dedit... Sicut enim Melchisedec benedixit, ita et Iste, et multo amplius quia Hic est sacerdos æternus, Ps. cix. Unde glossa, verbo soli convertit panem in corpus Suum. Est ergo sententia verbi ista, Hoc est corpus Meum, i. e. signatum per hoc convertendum in corpus Meum. Est corpus Meum. Vel hoc transit in corpus Meum quod est integrum et perfectum. Efficacia autem verbi est, ut hoc dicto fiat... In acceptione autem panis intelligitur assumptio carnis, quia dicitur, Caro Mea vere est cibus. Accepit panem ad designandum illud, Verbum

giving of thanks is understood the flowing down of graces from the Head into the church's whole body. 'Of His fulness we all have 'received, grace for grace,' John i., &c. This sacrament is in the highest degree a free gift, according to that saying, 'Freely ye have 'received, freely give.' (2) 'Do this,' &c. In which He gives power to them to do that which He did: and by this also delivered to them the priestly order... But the sacrifice itself was accepted and was placatory according to that word, 'A spiritual priesthood 'offering spiritual sacrifices,' &c., 1 Pet. ii. [addressed to *all* the Christians to whom he sent the epistle not to the priests alone or separately]. And hence it necessarily follows from this, that the most true body of Christ is contained (in the rite). (3) The evangelists do not express this in the same way. 'Likewise also,' &c. But the church uses none of those forms, for she says, This is the cup of My blood, of a new and eternal covenant, a mystery of the faith, which (blood) will be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins. Nor is there any contrariety, because they do not intend to precisely write down the form of words, but to weave together the history. But the church preserves the form delivered by the apostles in accomplishing (the change), which they also received from Christ.

P. 437. John vi. "In these words is figured the life-giving food, which is the flesh and blood of Jesus Christ and the bread of life according to His human nature. And accordingly three things are figured in words. (1) The pre-eminent dignity of the saving food: there 'flesh and blood,' i.e. Himself; (2) The perfection of the

---

caro factum est. In gratiarum actione intelligitur defluxus gratiarum a Capite in totum corpus ecclesiæ. De plenitudine Ejus omnes accipiunt gratiam pro gratiâ (John i.), &c. Sacramentum hoc est summe gratuitum, secundum illud, gratis accipistis, gratis date. (2) Hoc facite, &c. In quo dat eis potestatem, ut faciant quod Ipse fecit. Ac per hoc etiam sacerdotalem ordinem eis tradidit... Ipsum est sacrificium acceptum et placativum secundum illud, Sacerdotium sanctum offerentes spirituales hostias, &c. 1 Pet. ii. Et hinc quidem necesse est hinc, contineri verissimum corpus Christi. (3) Euangelistæ non eodem modo formam hanc exprimunt. Likewise also the cup, &c. Ecclesia autem nullâ istarum formarum utitur, nam dicit Hic est calix sanguinis Mei, novi et æterni testamenti, mysterium fidei, qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum. Nec est contrarietas quia non intendunt formam verborum præcisâ describere, sed historiam texere. Sed ecclesia servat formam ab apostolis traditam in conficiendo, quam et a Christo acceperunt.

P. 437, John VI. "*He that eateth my flesh,*" &c.

In his verbis figuratur cibus vivificus, qui est caro et sanguis Jesu Christi et panis vitæ secundum naturam humanam. Et secundum hoc tria in verbis figurantur (1) cibi salvifici preeminens dignitas, ibi "carnem et sanguinem" (i. e. Scipsum), (2) Modi sumendi perfectibilitas,

mode of taking, 'He eats;' (3) The efficacious virtue of that food in him that takes it in the due 'manner,' 'He has life'... On the contrary, by a deficiency in that eating the life fails. In Ps. ci. (cii.) 'I am stricken (with the sun) as hay, and my heart has become 'parched,' and elsewhere, Ps. cvi. (cvii.) 'Their soul hated all food' (i.e. the perfect) which is in the body and blood of Christ. [Is not *this* an arbitrary interpretation?]

P. 397. "Wisdom. The reality of grace came down with Him and is given (to us), as the day when the manna was coming down. And therefore the bread is called the eucharist. Eucharist is interpreted good grace. [How strange the nescience of Greek!]

P. 76. "Although the Son of God had given a great token of love and benevolence in the incarnation, by giving Himself to be a brother to the human race, by taking our nature, by giving Himself in His passion for the price of our redemption, by bearing the penalty, yet it was a greater token of His affection when He gave up His own body to man for food to refresh him. For in two other ways is there a certain separation and division between the Giver and the thing given: but in that way there is a marvellous and endless union between the fed and the food, and there is a conversion of the one and of the other. And by reason of that union Christ says to the soul that tastes the sweetness of the sacrament of the eucharist and of His love, Canticles viii., 'Set me 'as a seal of love and benevolence (goodwill) on thy heart,' which is in the middle of a man, &c.

"Manducat" (3) Ejus cibi efficax virtuositas in sumente debito modo, "Habet vitam"... E contrario, defectu istius manducationis deficit vita. In Ps. ci., Percussus sum ut fœnum, et aruit cor meum, et alibi Ps. cvi., Omnem escam, i.e. perfectam (quæ est in corpore et sanguine Domini), abominata est anima eorum, &c.

*I. p. 397. On the book Wisdom.*

Cum ipso res gratiæ descendit et datur, sicut ut ad nos cum manna descendebat. Et ideo panis iste Eucharistia dicitur. Eucharistia bona gratia interpretatur.

*III. p. 76. Sermo I.*

Licet magnum signum charitatis et benevolentiae fecerit Filius Dei in incarnatione, dando Se in fratrem humani generis, naturam assumendo, in passione dando Se in præmium nostræ redemptionis, pœnam sustinendo, majus tamen signum dilectionis fuit, cum proprium corpus tradidit homini in cibum refectionis. Nam in aliis duobus modis est quædam separatio et divisio inter dantem et datum; sed isto modo est mirabilis et interminabilis unio inter cibatum et cibum, et conversio unius et alterius. Et ratione istius unionis dicit Christus animæ gustanti dulcedinem sacramenti eucharistiæ et amoris, Song of Sol. viii., Pone me, ut signaculum charitatis et benevolentiae, super cor tuum (quod est in medio homine, &c.).

P. 86. Psalm cx. (cxi.) “‘He made a memorial’ [Eng. He hath made His wonderful works to be remembered, &c.]... ‘He gave meat to them that fear Him.’ For as the uniting of food to them that receive it is great, because it is united with their body and blood, so are we marvellously united to the flesh of Christ’s body.”

---

*P. 86, Sermo IV., Psalm CX. (CXI.)*

Memoriam fecit, &c., usque, Escam dedit timentibus Se. Sicut enim magna est unio escarum ad sumentem quia carni et sanguini sumentis unitur, sic nos mirabiliter unimur escâ corporis Christi.

(G.) NICETAS CHONIATES ACOMINATUS. 1205—70.

Who would suppose that this is only another name for a Colossian? but so runs the history, be it fabulous or true, that Chonæ was given as a name to the city Colossæ when a large flood by which the heathen had hoped to destroy the church was received by a vast chasm made by the archangel Michael striking the rock after the manner of Moses. The church had been dedicated to the archangel. Hence it was called Chonæ from the gaping chasm. Nicetas had an elder brother called Michael; and he went to Byzantium to see him, and became so learned that Manuel Comnenus raised him to be one of his own scribes or secretaries. He received many honours under successive emperors, and married into the Belissariot family. But he suffered when the Venetians captured the city. His greatest work is the Treasury of the Orthodox Faith, of which an appropriate specimen is given. He also wrote a history embracing the time of his patron and of Andronicus Comnenus and Isaac Angelus down to the taking of the city.

His brother Michael is the source of our knowledge of many of the details of his life. The works were discovered and edited by Angelo Mai. His elder brother Michael seems to have been at the head of the church in Athens.

P. 133. “And I believe and say that the virgin that bare Him after the flesh, the holy virgin Mary, and that remained after his

---

*Opera, Migne, Vols. CXXXIX., CXL. Thesaurus, Lib. XX.,*

*p. 133 B.*

Καὶ τὴν κατὰ σάρκα τοῦτον τεκοῦσαν παρθένον, ἁγίαν Μαρίαν παρθένον, καὶ μέιναν μετὰ τόκον παρθένον, κυρίως καὶ ἀληθῶς Θεοτόκον, καὶ πιστεύω

birth a virgin, is properly and truly mother of God, when He put Himself in man; and on this account I worship and honour her as having become by grace lady and mistress of all the creation. And I am persuaded and confess and believe that the bread mystically used in sacred service with the Christians and the wine too, of which they partake in the Divine rites, are the body and blood in truth of the Lord Jesus Christ, changed by His Divine power intelligently and in an unseen way above all physical conception, in a way that He alone knows. And thus I also covenant that I will partake of them as being in truth His flesh and blood, and being partaken of by those who share them in perfect faith, unto sanctification both of soul and of body and unto eternal life and an inheritance of the kingdom of Heaven [and of baptism as a regeneration of the soul and the body, and then of the cross as an instrument of freedom and life eternal, and then of images of the Word and the holy virgin mother of God and the Divine angels, like God in form *θεοειδεων*, and of all the saints to be received honoured and saluted]. I receive and honour and salute... But if I say these things with hypocrisy and deceit and not of the faith of my whole soul and a heart that loves Christ, may I have anathema and catathema, and may my soul be ranged with Satan and the demons."

---

καὶ λέγω, καὶ ὡς κατ' ἀληθείαν μητέρα Θεοῦ ἐνανθρωπήσαντος· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο κυρίαν καὶ δέσποιναν ἐν χάριτι γεγεννημένην πάσης τῆς κτίσεως προσκυνῶ καὶ τιμῶ. Καὶ τὸν παρὰ τοῖς Χριστιανοῖς μυστικῶς ἱεουργούμενον ἄρτον καὶ τὸν οἶνον, ὧν ἐν ταῖς Θεαῖς τελεταῖς μεταλαμβάνονσι, πείθομαι καὶ ὁμολογῶ καὶ πιστεύω σῶμα καὶ αἷμα κατ' ἀληθείαν εἶναι τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, μεταβαλλόμενα τῇ Ἐκείνου Θεικῇ δυνάμει νοερῶς τε καὶ ἀοράτως ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν φυσικὴν ἔννοιαν, ὡς οἶδε μόνος Αὐτός. Καὶ οὕτω ἀγῶν μεταλήψεσθαι τούτων συντίθεμαι ὡς κατὰ ἀληθείαν ὄντων σαρκός τε καὶ αἵματος Αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἰς ἀγιασμόν ψυχῆς τε καὶ σώματος καὶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον καὶ βασιλείας οὐρανῶν κληρονομίαν μεταλαμβάνομένων, τοῖς αὐτῶν ἐν πίστει τελείᾳ μετέχουσι. δέχομαι καὶ τιμῶ καὶ ἀσπάζομαι... Εἰ δὲ μεθ' ὑποκρίσεως καὶ δόλου ταῦτά φημι καὶ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως ὁλοφύχον καὶ καρδίας τὸν Χριστὸν ἀγαπώσης εἴη μοι ἀνάθεμα καὶ κατάθεμα, καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ μου ταχθεῖ μετὰ τοῦ Σατανᾶ καὶ τῶν δαιμόνων. Thus ends Book 20 of the *Thesaurus*.

(H.) ALBERTUS MAGNUS, SON OF A GERMAN PRINCE.

B. 1193. D. 1288.

It would seem to be the fashion in Germany now not only to make Albert the Great the fountain at which the great St Thomas drank, but to represent the latter as nothing more than a retailer at second-hand of Albert's ideas. This differs very widely from



Albert's own estimate of his disciple Aquinas. The well-known story should not be forgotten, how some coeval scholars thought Aquinas a very inferior and heavy mind, as he went everywhere listening in silence and pondering with that great attribute of true genius, unlimited patience. And they said he is but a dumb ox. But Albertus Magnus had formed quite another estimate of the man, and answered that this dumb ox would one day open his mouth, and the sound of his lowing would fill the world.

Albert was successively Vicar-General of his order, master of the Pope's palace, and Bishop of Ratisbon in 1260. He resigned it to spend his last years in the chief place of his teaching, Cologne.

In comparing Albert with his disciple and successor we can hardly wonder at finding great diversity of opinion, when we bear in mind that Albert left 21 folio volumes behind him. How few in the present age would dream of making more than a salient acquaintance with them! But Hefele, who praises Albert for the vast extent of his knowledge, places him not only below Aquinas but also below Anselm and Erigena in acuteness and power and fertility of spirit. While of those that depreciate him mere witticisms are recorded. He had a hollow head of brass, which would give you a sound in reply to any question whatever. Then as to the voluminous character of his works, the jest of Cicero is made to serve; that the cremation of his body could be done by one copy of each of his own writings. He not only revived the study of Aristotle and his Moorish commentators, such as Avicenna in particular, but he was so little of a scrutinizer of the ideas that he adopted as to give four general qualities to the four elements, the hot and the cold, the moist and the dry. That he held judicial astrology to be a science is less strange. One might adduce more; but Bacon believed in exact cubes of septarian clay as a cure for the stone. Men may be great who have their weak points, and are not to be charged with the guilt of all current errors.

P. 92. "(1) Of the sacrifice of the mass, (2) of the eucharist. A sacrament is grace upon grace, as it were containing (in it) a

---

*Vol. XXI. Dist. I., L. V. Tract. III. c. XXIII.  
In quibusdam missis, p. 92. Lugduni, 1602.*

(1) De sacrificio missæ. (2) De eucharistiâ. Sacramentum est gratia super gratiam quasi cumulum continens gratiarum. Confert

heap of graces. For it confers the grace of communication, and upon this the grace of expiation, and upon these two the grace of redemption, and upon these three the grace of quickening, and upon these four the grace of spiritual refreshment, and upon these five it signifies to us the glory of eternal blessedness... and from the body indeed it confers the grace of the communion with all Christ's members: but from the blood it gives the grace of expiation; but from the soul the grace of redemption: and from the Spirit of Christ it gives the grace of quickening and of virtue: but from His Godhead it brings the grace of refection; and from the whole sign it gives the sacrament of eternal blessedness... [The mind fails to discern any foundation in fact for ascribing these details of 'the benefits which we receive' to these particular sources: and Albert gives no reasons. Nor indeed does he stoop to any proof that this sacrament does 'confer' all this. It must be ranged under the general head of arbitrary assertions in theology.] ... Matt. xiii. 'The meaning is this which we put forth in relation to the case of the eucharist, on account of which it is called the eucharist. All this of its having to do with our salvation proceeded from Christ Himself, John i. Nor could we in any way accept even concerning this that it depends on Him unless we were in communion with Him. But we are not truly in communion with Him, except it be in the sacrament of communion, Matt. xxvi. As if he said, The fulness of grace which is in Me, in the sacramental vessel of My body, and out of that grace ye will receive the reconciled and forgiven. [Is not this a purely arbitrary interpretation and not a likely one?]. And here He is all fully contained in the whole band of graces, proving that everywhere, since 'grace and truth *were made* through Jesus Christ,' as this is

enim gratiam communicationis, et super hanc gratiam expiationis, et super has duas gratiam redemptionis, et super has tres gratiam vivificationis, et super has quatuor gratiam refectionis spiritualis, et super has quinque significat nobis gloriam æternæ beatitudinis... et *ex corpore quidem* confert gratiam communionis omnium Christi membrorum; *ex sanguine* autem dat gratiam expiationis; *ex animâ* vero gratiam redemptionis; et *ex Spiritu Christi* dat gratiam vivificationis et virtutis; *ex Deitate* autem affert gratiam refectionis; et *ex toto signo sacramentum* dat æternæ beatitudinis... Matt. xiii., They shall shine as the sun, &c. Hæc est significatio quam modo in eucharistiâ præsentamus, propter quod eucharistia vocatur. Totum etiam hoc quod nostræ salutis est in Ipso processit. John i., And of His fulness, &c. Nec aliquo modo etiam de hoc quod in Ipso est, accipere possemus, nisi sibi communicarem. Non autem vere communicamus nisi in communicationis sacramento, Matt. xxvi. Ac si dicat gratiæ plenitudinem quæ in Me est, in *vase sacramentali corporis mei*, et ex illâ recipietis reconciliatum et remissum... Et hic totus in omni gratiæ choro plenus continetur, ubique probans, quoniam "gratia et veritas est per Jesum Christum facta," ut dicitur hoc

called a sacred sign, therefore to *all* that receive this sacrament of the eucharist the fulness of grace and the whole gospel of grace is communicated... In what way is this sacrament under the class of sacrifices? Let us at last see concerning the truth of the sacrifice. But that alone is the truth of the sacrifice (*i.e.* shews it) that all that which it marks, it abundantly causes, and contains in itself by the grace of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ... Whether (it should be) with unleavened or with leavened bread.

P. 134. "But as to Christ's giving His own body after other food, four reasons are assigned by doctors. The first is because He gave it as a memorial that it might be more intimately entrusted to the memory. The second, because the new might be brought forth out of the old, which would not come to pass unless the typical lamb had first been received. The third reason is, because, as His disciples were already quaking like little birds clucking, this sacrament is given last of all to produce firmness of heart. The fourth reason was that it might be signified that that food is not of the body, but of the soul, and therefore it was received; as all things pertaining to the (bodily) necessity had been already taken... Although Christ gave His own body to them when they had now supped, yet it was reverently and salutarily provided by the church afterwards, that excepting the cases (*lit.* the article) of necessity and infirmity (sickness) the body of the Lord be not received except by fasting persons."

The second seems to me the leading reason. But the real ground of the church's command seems to be the belief that

---

sacramentum. Omnibus igitur hoc sacramentum eucharistiæ percipientibus gratiæ plenitudo et vas omnis gratiæ communicatur... [Dist. V. § 4.] Quomodo hoc sacramentum sit in genere sacrificii? Begins, Tandem videndum est de hujus sacrificii veritate. Istud autem solum est sacrificii veritas, quia omne id, quod signat, abundanter causat, et continet in seipso per gratiam corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi... [Dist. VI. c. 1.] Utrum in azymis an in fermentato.

P. 134.

Quod autem Christus *post alios cibos* corpus Suum dedit, quatuor a doctoribus assignantur rationes. Prima est quia in memoriale dedit ut arctius memoriæ commendaretur. Secunda ut novum ex veteri... produceretur, quod non fieret nisi prius agnus typicus sumptus fuisset. Tertia ratio est quia jam crepitantibus discipulis istud post omnia datur in firmitatem cordis. Quarta ratio fuit ut significaretur quod iste cibus non est corporis sed animæ, et ideo sumptus est, omnibus aliis ad necessitatem pertinentibus jam ante sumptis... Quamvis Christus cænatis jam eis dederit corpus Suum, tamen reverenter et salubriter ab ecclesiâ postea provisum est, ut excepto necessitatis et infirmitatis articulo, non nisi a jejunis corpus Domini accipiatur.

the bread and wine ought to be treated with the reverence of fasting, because the church held that the bread and wine were after some mode or other changed into Christ's real natural body and blood. Albert puts the reasons with great adroitness: but adroitness cannot make an unwarranted law authoritative.

(I.) THOMAS AQUINAS. B. 1224. D. 1274.

The scholastic divines were greatly aided by the half-eastern character of the court of Frederic II. in his beloved Sicily. He strengthened the hold of Aristotle upon them by causing translations of some of his works, probably the *Ethics*, *Logic*, and *Metaphysics*, to be made and circulated. His *Politics* probably got less attention. Received at first through Arabian sages in Spain, they were now naturalized in the Western Church. Thus the greatest works of Aquinas are, first of all, his *Summa Artis Theologicæ*, and then his commentaries on Aristotle. He also wrote commentaries on Scripture, and numerous treatises. It is a matter of the greatest wonder that these, which were for many centuries the training-books of theo-scholastic giants, should be now almost entirely cast aside. Is it in part that the works of each of them are a continent of tens of folios?

It is an interesting enquiry. The scholastic extracts on this subject of the Lord's supper are almost enough to shew that the boundless distributiveness of the method taxes the mind too severely, and wastes its energies upon too large a surface; and that the heaping up of good and bad reasons on each detail of the distribution wears out and annoys enquirers. Perhaps no system ever ministered so much of false pride to its professors and to their thick and thin admirers. All this is now repaid, principal and interest together, by so general a neglect, that even the research of Dean Milman is baffled and overtaken, and he retires upon the superficial banter, with which from Gibbon's time the very mention of them has been received. Nevertheless one may venture, as intimated in the remarks on Anselm, to believe that the scholastics did important service. For in spite of papal exhortations, piled up to restrict men to the choice sentences of the Fathers in their received senses, it was impossible that Franciscan and Dominican teachers should contend in their several schools with the regular

University professors, and struggle hard with them for victory, without getting some new victories, without emanations of unauthorized light, without some glimpses of hidden and forbidden truths. All such discoveries would be eagerly caught and promulgated. Such was the real work then going forward: and peradventure even in this day our opinions might be sometimes at least cleared and confirmed, if not enlightened and promoted, by the endless tilting of these mediæval champions. It may be well to know something of what they thought and said.

Mattés in treating on Aquinas defines the scholastic method as "theology considered as an universal science." If this were a complete definition we should become scholastics now: but it is evidently the extent of its aims; whereas the method itself is that general subdivision into elemental particles which has been termed its wearying universal distributiveness, and baffles human retention. As to Aquinas something of De Thou's eulogium may with pleasure be remembered. He claims for him great humility, purity, fervency in prayer, prudence, abounding charity, luminous intelligence, and a spirit altogether above the world. He was tall and manly and "of high birth." His *Summa Theologiæ* is by Mattés considered a complete and faithful reflection of the scholastic system. Mohler describes the system as a continuous effort to shew "that what is Christian is reasonable and that what is "reasonable is Christian." Bergen in his theologic dictionary is more explicit. He says its object was (1) to reduce all theology into one body and to distribute the questions in order, so that one may shed light on another and the whole make a system which should be mutually connected, in regular sequence and complete, and to regulate all this by logic and metaphysic so as to reconcile and unite reason and Christianity. This luminous definition leaves nothing to be desired except its accomplishment, if it be possible within the range and reach of human power, so as to be safe in the arguing out of every portion. This however does not seem possible, a shorter method being more correspondent to the extent of man's comprehensiveness. The conclusion then seems to be that their works may be useful in parts but that they are not adapted as a system of training. Another definition is "the "scientific history of the church's faith."

Thomas was born at Rocca Secca or Aquino in the kingdom of Naples. His father was a count. His grandfather married a

sister of Frederic Barbarossa. His own mother Theodora was of a princely Norman family. The three books to which he devoted himself when he persisted against all his mother's efforts in retiring from high life were the Bible, Peter Lombard, and Aristotle. In 1245 a chapter-general at Rome decided that he should put himself under the greatest of all the instructors of the age, Albert, at Cologne. In 1245 he was chosen as a Dominican champion before Alexander IV., when the Sorbonne doctors pleaded not only against the teaching but against the continued existence of the two orders: and the struggle was renewed before Clement IV. In 1261 he was summoned to Rome by Urban IV., where he is said to have refused the "red hat" and scarlet robes of a cardinal. He often preached in the churches of Italy. His *Catena*, which received the title "golden," was a continuous exposition of the four Gospels with the aid of the fathers and all valuable writers. He wrote an Office of the very holy sacrament. He died journeying at Lyons. He received the communion before he died, and his exclamation of thanks is said to have begun with these words, "I have received Thee, O God." And Albert is reported to have had his death revealed to him.

Q. LXXIII. "This sacrament has a threefold meaning, (1) in respect of the past, inasmuch, that is to say, as it is commemorative of the Lord's passion, which was a true sacrifice, and in accordance with it this sacrament is named a sacrifice; (2) in respect of a thing present, *i.e.* the church unity, in which men constituted a body by this sacrament and in accordance with this are called a communion or *σύναξις*. For Damascene says that it is called a communion because we communicate by the sacrament itself with Christ, and because we share His flesh and Divinity, and we who communicate are also mutually united together by the communion itself; (3) with respect to the future in so far, that is, as this

---

*Summa Theolog. Quæstio LXXIII. Art. IV. Bas-le-duc, 1870.*

Hoc sacramentum habet triplicem significationem, (1) respectu præteriti in quantum scilicet est commemorativum Dominicæ passionis, quæ fuit verum sacrificium et secundum hoc *nominatur sacrificium*; (2) respectu rei præsentis, *i.e.* ecclesiasticæ unitatis in quâ homines aggregantur per hoc sacramentum, et secundum hoc *nominatur communio* vel *σύναξις*. Dicit enim Damascenus, quod dicitur communio quia communicamus per ipsum cum Christo (Orth. fid. ix. 14, ad fin.), et quia participamus Ejus carne et Divinitate, et qui communicamus et unimur ad invicem per ipsam; (3) respectu futuri in quantum scilicet

sacrament is a prefiguration of the fruition of God, which will be when we are in our own fatherland: and in accordance with this it is called the viaticum, because this sacrament holds out to us the way of arriving thither: and according to this it is called eucharist, because the grace of God is life eternal, as it is said, Rom. vi. 23: or because it really contains Christ Who is full of grace. For it is called in Greek *μετάληψις*, i.e. taking to us, because, as Damascene says, by this we *take to us* the Deity of the Son [imperfect idea of Greek still] ... This sacrament is called a sacrifice inasmuch as it represents Christ's passion. But it is called host (victim) inasmuch as it contains Christ Himself, Who is the saving victim as He is called, Eph. v.

P. 1153. "The passage of Damascene to which he alludes. But it is called *μετάληψις*: for by it we partake of the Deity of Jesus [not we take to us]. But it is both called and truly is communion on account of our having fellowship with Christ by it and partaking both of His flesh and Godhead and having fellowship and being made one with each other by it. For since we partake from one bread, we all are one body of Christ and one blood and become members of one another, being called of God, of the same body with Him (or partners in one body) ... But they are called figures of the things to come, not as not being truly the body and blood of Christ, but on the contrary that we are now indeed partaking of the Godhead of Christ, but then we shall do it perceptibly by the sight of Him alone. [I should have liked everywhere to translate the word for "partakers" by the word "sharers," only it would be or seem less reverent.]

---

hoc sacramentum est præfiguratio fruitionis Dei, quæ erit in Patriâ, et secundum hoc dicitur viaticum, quia hoc præbet nobis viam illic perveniendi: et secundum hoc dicitur eucharistia, quia gratia Dei vita æterna, ut dicitur, Rom. vi. 23; vel quia *realiter* continet Christum, Qui est "plenus gratiæ." Dicitur enim in Græco *μετάληψις*, i.e. assumptio, quia, ut Damascenus dicit, per hoc Filii Deitatem assumimus... Hoc sacramentum dicitur sacrificium in quantum representat passionem Christi. Dicitur autem *hostia* in quantum continet Ipsum Christum, qui est hostia salutaris ut dicitur (Eph. v.).

IV. 13, 14. Vol. I. p. 1153.

Damasceni locus. *Μετάληψις* δὲ λέγεται. Δι' αὐτῆς γὰρ τῆς Ἰησοῦ Θεότητος μεταλαμβάνομεν. Κοινωνία δὲ λέγεται τε καὶ ἐστὶν ἀληθῶς, διὰ τὸ κοινωνεῖν ἡμᾶς δι' αὐτῆς τῷ Χριστῷ καὶ μετέχειν Αὐτοῦ τῆς σαρκὸς τε καὶ Θεότητος, κοινωνεῖν δὲ καὶ ἐνοῦσθαι ἀλλήλοις δι' αὐτῆς. Ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἐξ ἑνὸς ἄρτου μεταλαμβάνομεν, οἱ πάντες ἐν σῶμα Χριστοῦ καὶ ἐν αἵμα, καὶ ἀλλήλων μέλη γινόμεθα, συσσωμοί Χριστοῦ χρηματίζοντες... Ἀντίτυπα δὲ τῶν μελόντων λέγεται, οὐκ ὥς μὴ ὄντα ἀληθῶς σῶμα καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ, ἀλλ' ὅτι νῦν μὲν δι' αὐτῶν μετέχομεν τῆς Χριστοῦ Θεότητος, τότε δὲ νοητῶς διὰ μόνης τῆς θέας.

Q. LXII. "Whether there is in sacraments any causative virtue? There is in sacraments a certain instrumental virtue—a virtue to bring on grace, &c. as an instrument set in motion by the principal acting power. Those who lay down that the sacraments do not cause grace, except by a certain concomitance (they think this, who teach that sacraments cause grace not physically, *i.e.* by natural means, but by moral action, *i.e.* by holy thoughts, &c. It is difficult to say in what sense they can understand those words of Æneas Sylvius and others, *operari ex operato*, working by the mere fact of the rite being observed), they lay down that there is not in the sacrament any virtue to work (of itself) for the sacrament's effect. Yet there is such virtue, &c., &c. For which reason it is compared to the absolute and perfected virtue of anything... the virtue of a principal (or initiant) acting power has a permanent and complete "being" in nature; but an instrumental virtue has "a being" passing from one to another and not completed. (1) Nothing prevents a spiritual virtue from existing in a body after the manner of an instrument, as there is in a perceptible voice a certain spiritual force to excite a man's understanding. [We should say that this is one of the sentences that would be made true by inserting the word "not." There is *not* in the voice *itself*, &c., &c.] And in this manner there is [not] a spiritual force in the sacraments. (2) As motion is not properly [to be classified] in any genus... so an instrumental virtue is not in any genus, &c., &c. (3) As an instrumental virtue is acquired by an instrument from its merely being moved by a principal acting force, so a sacrament also acquires a spiritual virtue from

*Quæstio LXII. Art. IV.*

Utrum in sacramentis sit aliqua virtus causativa? Est in sacramentis quædam instrumentalis virtus ad inducendam gratiam, &c. sicut instrumentum a principali agente motum. Illi qui ponunt quod sacramenta non causant gratiam nisi *per quandam concomitantiam* (ita sentiunt qui docent sacramenta causare gratiam *non physice sed moraliter*. Illis difficile est dicere, quomodo ea intelligant ea *operari ex operato*. Sylvius and others), ponunt quod in sacramento non sit aliqua virtus, quæ operetur ad sacramenti effectum. Est tamen virtus &c.; unde comparatur ad virtutem absolutam et perfectam alicujus rei... Virtus principalis agentis habet permanens et completum "esse" in naturâ: virtus autem instrumentalis habet "esse" transiens ex uno ad aliud et incompletum. (1) Nihil prohibet in corpore esse virtutem spirituales instrumentaliter, sicut in voce ipsâ sensibili est quædam vis spiritualis ad excitandum intellectum hominis... Et hoc modo vis spiritualis est in sacramentis. (2) Sicut motus... non proprie, est in aliquo genere... ita virtus instrumentalis non est in aliquo genere, &c. (3) Sicut virtus instrumentalis acquiritur instrumento ex hoc ipso quod movetur ab agente principali, ita et sacramentum consequitur



the benediction of Christ and its application by the minister to the use of the sacrament. Hence Augustine says in some sermon on the Epiphany, 'Nor is it wonderful that we say that water (that of baptism)—i.e. a corporeal substance—finds its way in to 'purify the soul. It does find its way indeed and penetrates all 'the hidingplaces of the conscience. For though it be itself 'subtile and thin, it is made more subtile by the benediction of 'Christ, and goes through the hidden causes of life and mental 'secrets with its subtile dew.' (4) As the same instrumental force of a principal agent is found in all instruments ordained to an effect (as they are in a certain order one), so also the same sacramental force is found in words and things, as by words and things the one sacrament is accomplished. Note. A virtue consists in material and form together." [Can any think that all this, acute as it is in comparison of his predecessor, proves anything, as to this sacrament having any inherent power of itself?]

---

spiritualem virtutem ex benedictione Christi et applicatione ministri ad usum sacramenti. Unde Augustinus dicit in quodam sermone de Epiphaniâ "Nec mirum quod aquam (baptismi)—hoc est substantiam "corporealem — ad purificandam animam dicimus pervenire, *Pervenit "plane et penetrat conscientie universa latibula. Quamvis enim sit "ipsa subtilis et tenuis, benedictione tamen Christi facta subtilior, "occultas vite causas ac secreta mentis subtili rore pertransit."* (4) Sicut eadem vis principalis agentis instrumentalis invenitur in omnibus instrumentis ordinatis ad effectum (prout sunt quodam ordine unum) ita etiam eadem vis sacramentalis invenitur in verbis et rebus prout ex verbis et rebus perficitur unum sacramentum. Note. Virtus constat in materia et forma simul. De veritate 27.

(J.) WILLIAM DURANDUS OR DURANTIS, BISHOP OF MENDE IN FRANCE. B. 1230. D. 1296.

The editor of his *Rationale* appositely quotes the saying of Cato, that a man should be able to give a good account of the way in which he spent his holiday-times as well as his busy periods, since the work of Durandus on the Divine Offices was the offspring of his leisure, while the setting forth of the civil law was the work of his more regular toil in Bologna and Modena. And the interval of leisure which he so employed was due to a change in his fortunes. The archbishopric of Ravenna he refused. John Aloisius of the Apostolic Chamber, addressing the Cardinal of Terason, states that Durandi has gathered into this book a statement of the figures, types and reasons of things in the whole of this most

sacred mystery, and done it with the greatest accuracy: and that he has gathered ideas that were scattered, and brought to light things that had lain hidden. His book of civil law was called "Mirror of the law," *Speculum Juris*. He was French by birth, but his training was under Henry of Susa at Bologna; he died in Italy, and at his death expressed a desire to be buried in Rome: but it does not appear that his wishes were fulfilled. A *Repertorium Juris Canonici* was compiled by him. He was a remarkable man for his age. Durandus or Durand de St Porcain was his nephew. The surprising thing in these extracts is the number of fallacies which they contain. To go through the task of exposing them all would be a waste of argument almost equal to shooting at a swarm of flies. And the marvel of our having such ideas presented to us for truth by a very accomplished bishop is to be explained only by the fact that he began to think soon after the council of the Lateran in which the full doctrine of Transubstantiation was received as catholic truth, notwithstanding all that John Scotus, Ratram, Berengarius and others had put forth against it. A general corruption of reasoning is apt to follow any bold outrage upon a great sacred truth. Men cannot play false with conscience and understanding and then recover their moral sense and clear intelligence at will. Not only *qui vult decipi decipiatur*: but *qui in uno errare mavult, in cæteris periclitatur*. Darkness and misinterpretations propagate themselves at certain times very rapidly. To cast aside the pure love of truth at all is a most perilous experiment in an individual, a nation, a church, or a general council.

P. 149. "Explanation of the Divine Offices. Of the Canon (Rule) of the Mass, Sanctus, &c. The church hoping to be united with angels and archangels, of whom mention has been made in the preface, immediately after it puts itself into conformity with the angelic song, singing that hymn, 'Holy, holy, holy,' which Pope Sixtus first ordained to be sung continually. For this is the

---

*Rationale Divinorum Officiorum, IV. c. XXXV. p. 149. Lugduni, 1560. De Canone Missæ. Sanctus, &c.*

*Ecclesia sperans sociari angelis et archangelis, de quibus in præfatione mentio facta est, statim post illam conformat se angelico cantui, canens hymnum illum "Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus," quem Sixtus Papa primus instituit decantari. Hic est enim cantus puerorum, quem*

song of the boys which they sang to the Lord when He presented Himself to them in the tenth moon (who was as it were reserved until the fourteenth moon) in Bethany ... Of the secret mass, &c. After the crying out of the notice there is a secret silence, in which both the canon of the mass is said devoutly and the sacred mystery is performed : which is done by the priest alone, since according to Matt. xxvi. Christ prayed alone ... But the rule of the mass is called both the offering ... and the action, and the rule, and the sacrifice, and the secret things. It is called the action on account of the sacred mysteries which are done in it, and because our cause is (then) pleaded with God ... It is also called the secret things, because it is done secretly and in silence. For Christ was praying secretly and alone when He was about to come to the consecration (sacrificing) of His body from the hour of supper until He was hanged on the cross, which prayers of His the expression 'the secret things' signify. [How well is it commanded not to add to the Scriptures! What a revulsion one feels at this intruding of the writer into the secrets of Christ's mental history at this time!] Also in ancient times the old fathers used to sacrifice in silence and partake (of the peace-offering) in silence, which we also observe on (their) holy sabbath ... The priest in the law had his face looking towards the mercy-seat ... so our priest also ought to have his heart set towards the mercy of God : and as the high-priest used to enter once a year into the holy of holies bearing the blood of the goat and the calf, so Christ also by His own blood entered in once into the holiest, having discovered (for us) eternal redemption : so also the minister of the church enters with blood into the holy of holies, as often as bearing the remem-

---

cantaverunt Domino offerenti Se illis in decimâ lunâ (qui quasi reservatus fuit usque ad quartam decimam lunam) in Bethaniâ...[C. 35.] De secretâ, &c. Post acclamatum præconium secretum silentium, quo et missæ canon devotè dicitur et sacrum mysterium peragitur : quod fit per solum sacerdotem ; quoniam secundum Mathæum xxvi. Christus solus orabat.... Canon autem missæ et oblatio...et actio et canon et sacrificium et secreta vocatur. Actio dicitur propter sacra mysteria quæ in eo aguntur, et quia tunc cum Deo agitur causa nostra... Dicitur etiam secreta, quia secreta et sub silentio dicitur. Christus enim ad consecrationem corporis Sui venturus secreta et solus orabat ab horâ cœnæ usque dum suspensus est in cruce, quas orationes secreta significant. Priscis quoque temporibus antiqui patres sub silentio sacrificabant et communicabant, quod etiam in sabbato sancto observamus. [C. 36.] Legalis sacerdos vultum versus propitiatorium habebat... ; sic et noster ad Dei clementiam cor debet habere : et sicut pontifex intrabat in sancta sanctorum semel in anno ferens sanguinem hirci aut vituli, sic et Christus per proprium sanguinem introivit semel in sancta, æternâ redemptione inventâ ; sic et minister ecclesiæ intrat cum sanguine in sancta sanctorum, quoties in mente memoriam sanguinis

brance of the blood of Christ, He in secret begins the mystery ; who not with his mind alone but also with the sign of the cross ... recites Christ's passion.

P. 154. "Or unstained, *i.e.* uncorrupt ; not because the substance of bread and wine cannot be corrupted ; but because the body and blood of the Son of God, in the power of the words pertaining to which the (two) kinds (appearances) have been transubstantiated, cannot be corrupted. Ps. cx.... 'Communing.' The high-priest indeed, as the law ordered, used to bear a censer full of live coals with him into the holy of holies ... ; and Christ bare with Him to the stars the censer of His own flesh full of every power (virtue). [Note. Not a word about a celestial parallel to the high-priest's carrying *the blood* within the veil. He says Christ entered by His own blood, but not, took *His own blood* into Heaven as if *propitiation were to be wrought in Heaven*, which was 'finished' on the cross]. So our holy priest, being in the place of Christ, ought to approach to the sacrifice of the altar, empty of sins and full of the odours of virtues ... The priest in the mass thrice kisses the altar ... To mark the amount of the price at which Christ was sold, the priest here generally makes three crosses over the offering and the cup when he says 'blessed,' 'dedicated' and 'ratified,' for three hundred and thirty are from the number three : but afterwards to mark the selling and buying (he makes) two crosses, &c.

P. 160. "Secondly, three crosses are made because Christ received [*i.e.* the loaf from one of the disciples] and blessed and

Christi gerens secretè inchoat mysterium ; qui non solum mente sed etiam crucis signaculo... Christi recitat passionem.

P. 154.

Vel illibata, *i. e.* incorrupta ; non quia substantia panis et vini corrumpi non possit ; sed quia corpus et sanguis Filii Dei, in quâ virtute verborum species transubstantiatæ sunt, corrumpi non possunt. Ps. cx. [C. 38.] Communicantes. Sane pontifex, ut lex jubebat, turibulum vivis carbonibus plenum intra sancta sanctorum secum portabat ... ; et Christus carnis Suæ turibulum omni virtute plenum tulit ad astra ; sic et sacerdos noster, Christi vicem tenens, vacuus peccatis et plenus virtutum odoribus ad sacrificium altaris accedere debet. [C. 39.] Sacerdos in missâ ter osculatur altare. [C. 40.] Ad designandum pretii quantitatem, quo Christus venditus est, sacerdos hic facit tres cruces communiter super oblatam et calicem cum dicit, "benedictam," "ascriptam" et "ratam," nam trecenta et triginta...a numero ternario : postmodum autem ad designandam venditionem et emptionem duas cruces, &c.

P. 160.

Secundo fiunt tres cruces...quia Christus accepit, benedixit et dedit.

gave (to them). Afterwards he makes one cross specially on the oblation because (Christ said) 'Eat ye, &c.' and another over the cup because He said, 'Drink ye, &c.' Thirdly three crosses are made because Judas sold Christ to be crucified by three, *i.e.* the priests, the scribes, and the Pharisees, &c. *Εὐχαριστία*, which is explained in Latin by Isidore as good grace: or according to others the giver of grace [astonishing!]. But it is called 'Host,' victim, according to the Jews, from 'ostium,' the gate, since it was offered at the gate of the tabernacle; but according to the Gentiles [*i.e.*, *e.g.* Ovid] from 'hostis,' an enemy, &c.

P. 163. "The Greeks however persisting in their error, make it of leavened bread, calling the Latins Azymites [users of unleavened bread].

P. 164. "Since the Lord first brake before He consecrated, it seems that the church which consecrates before it breaks, acts in the contrary way to what Christ did, and so sins, since His action ought to be our teaching, &c., &c. [the excuses to be made for the church in so ruling in this matter]. It can indeed be said that Christ with Divine virtue first accomplished hidden things for us, and afterwards uttered the form under which men coming after Him should bless. For He Himself blessed with His own virtue; but we out of that virtue, which He put into the words. When therefore the priest pronounces those words of Christ, 'This is My 'body,' the bread and wine are converted into body and blood, by that force of the word by which the Word was made flesh and

Postmodum specialiter facit unam crucem super oblatam quia dixit, Comedite, &c. et alteram super calicem quia dixit, Bibite, &c. Tertio fiunt tres cruces quia Judas vendidit Christum ad crucifigendum tribus, scilicet sacerdotibus, scribis et Phariseis, &c. &c. [C. 41.] *εὐχαριστία* quod Latine exponitur per Isidorum bona gratia: vel secundum alios dator gratiæ... Hostia vero secundum Hebræos dicitur ab ostio quoniam ad ostium tabernaculi offerebatur: sed secundum Gentiles ab hoste.

P. 163.

Græci tamen, in suo persistentes errore, de fermentato conficiunt, Latinos azymitas vocantes.

P. 164.

Cum Dominus prius fregerit quam consecraverit, videtur quod ecclesia, quæ prius consecrat quam frangat, aliter agat quam Christus egerit, et sic peccat, quoniam Ejus actio nostra debet esse instructio... Long and insufficient explanation, ending Sane dici potest quod Christus virtute Divinâ nobis occulta primo confecit et postea formam expressit sub quâ posteri benedicant. Ipse namque virtute propriâ benedixit; nos vero ex illâ virtute quam indidit verbis. Cum ergo sacerdos illa Christi verba pronunciat, Hoc est, &c., panis et vinum in carnem et sanguinem convertuntur illâ verbi virtute, quâ Verbum caro factum

dwelt among us, because He said and they were made, He commanded and they were created, by which He changed a woman (Lot's wife) into a statue and converted a rod into a serpent, and fountains into blood and water into wine. For if the word of Elijah could bring down fire from Heaven, could not Christ's word change bread into flesh? Certainly it is greater to create that which is not out of nothing than it is to transmute it into another thing ... and incomparably greater is it that God was made man, that He ceased not to be God, than that bread so becomes flesh, and that it ceases to be bread. That former thing was once done by the incarnation, the latter is done continually by the consecration. Therefore at the putting forth then of the words the bread is transubstantiated by Divine power into flesh. For the Word is the Divine and material substance of this sacrifice; which coming to the element accomplishes a sacrament, as the Word united to the flesh made the man Christ. But it must be observed that in the body of Christ eleven miracles are being considered, of which an express account cannot be given. The first is that the bread and wine are transubstantiated, &c. The second that there is no augmenting of God by it, &c. The third, that it is daily received and eaten, nor is there any diminution of it. The fourth is that an indivisible thing is divided and remains whole and entire in any part of the eucharist whatever. The reason is, as in a glass in which anything is represented, and if it be divided into parts, the same whole is represented in any part whatever. [This illustration can hardly be termed *fallacious* argument.] The sixth, that Christ's body which is the food of life becomes deadly in the

---

est et habitavit in nobis; quia, Dixit et facta sunt, mandavit et creata sunt, quâ fœminam mutavit in statuem, et virgam convertit in colubrem, quâ fontes mutavit in sanguinem, et aquam in vinum. Nam si verbum Helie potuit ignem de cœlo deponere, nonne verbum Christi potuit panem in carnem mutare? Certe majus est de nihilo creare quod non est, quam quod est in aliud transmutare...et incomparabiliter majus est quam [*lege* quod] Deus ita factus est homo, quod non desiit esse Deus, quam quod panis ita fit caro, quod desinit esse panis. Illud per incarnationem semel factum est, istud per consecrationem jugiter fit. Ad prolationem igitur verborum panis Divinitus transubstantiatur in carnem. Divina enim et materialis hujus sacrificii substantia est Verbum: quod accedens ad elementum perficit sacramentum sicut Verbum carni unitum effecit hominem Christum. Notandum est autem quod in corpore Christi undecim miracula considerantur, de quibus expressa ratio reddi non potest... Primum est quod panis et vinum transubstantiantur, &c. Secundum...quod...nullum augmentum fit in Deo, &c. Tertium quia quotidie sumitur et comeditur nec aliqua fit ejus diminutio. Quartum est quia indivisibile dividitur et in qualibet parte eucharistiæ totus et integer remanet. Ratio, in speculo in quo aliquid repræsentatur: et, si dividatur in partes, in qualibet parte idem representatur. Sextum, quia corpus Christi quod est cibus vitæ

case of sinners. The seventh, that when it is taken and the mouth shut, it is carried off to heaven [to join the rest of Christ's body]. The eighth, Though it is a body of unlimited magnitude it stands in so small a (thing as the) host. The ninth, that the same body has been made to be in such divers places at the same time, and is received (in each) by different persons. And the reason seems to be because both a word of men once put forth, is, according to the nature of the voice, all at the same time in the ears of divers persons. [Another illustration *ex diverso in genere*.] Besides, He Who made body and place, made both to be in either as He will. Again the sun and the moon and light are seen by different persons in divers places. The tenth, that the accidents of bread remain, &c. The eleventh, that under the appearance of bread are and are received the body and the blood, yea the whole Christ. In like manner under the appearance of wine, &c. And yet there is not a double receiving twice.

P. 165. After five reasons why Christ's body and blood have the appearance of bread and wine. "He brake." People usually ask what it was that Christ brake at the table and what it is that the priest breaks on the altar. And some were found to say that as the true accidents of bread remain after consecration, so also does the true substance of the bread: because a subject cannot subsist without its accidents, and so accidents cannot subsist without their subject; since the being (or nature) of an accident is nothing else than to be in (some subject). But that while the substances of bread and wine continue up to the putting forth of those words, the body and blood of Christ begin to be truly under

---

peccatoribus est mortale, &c. Septimum, quia sumptum... ore clauso, in cælum rapitur. Octavum, cum sit corpus immensum quod in tam parvâ hostiâ stat. Nonum, quod idem corpus totum simul in diversis locis constitit et a diversis percipitur, et videtur ratio quia et verbum hominum, semel prolatum, juxta vocis naturam, totum simul est in auribus diversorum. Præterea Qui fecit corpus et locum, utrumque fecit in altero esse ut vult. Rursus luna et sol et lumen in diversis locis a diversis videntur. Decimum, quia...remanent accidentia panis, &c. Undecimum, quia sub specie panis est et sumitur corpus et sanguis imo totus Christus. Similiter sub specie vini, &c. Et tamen non est bis duplex sumptio, &c.

P. 165.

After five reasons why Christ's body is given to us *under another form*. On the word "Fregit," Quæri solet quid Christus in mensâ fregit et quid sacerdos in altari frangit. Et fuerunt qui dixerunt quod sicut post consecrationem vera panis remanent accidentia, sic et vera panis substantia: quia subjectum non potest subsistere sine accidentibus, sic accidentia non possunt subsistere sine subjecto: quoniam accidentis esse non est aliud quam inesse. Sed panis et vini substantiis permanentibus ad prolationem illorum verborum, corpus et sanguis Christi

them, so that both substances are truly included under the same accidents; that is, (both) bread and flesh (both) wine and blood; one of each of which pair the sense allows; the remaining one faith believes (to be there)... From the recantation of Berengarius... But if it be asked, What does a mouse eat, when the sacrament is eaten by it (*corroditur* would be gnawed), or what is burned when the sacrament is burned? Innocent himself answers that the substance as of bread is miraculously turned into the Lord's body when it begins to exist under the sacrament, so in some miraculous way it returns when it ceases to be there itself (any more); not that that substance of bread, which passed into flesh, returns; but that something is by a miracle created in its place. [To what strange hypotheses believers in the actual change are driven! We should be too, were it true.]

P. 179. "The high-priest, as the law ordered.. used to sprinkle the table and the altar and the holy place without with the peace-making blood. And Christ so often *sprinkles the Father* with blood [How dares any man *add* such a detail to God's book?] as often as He appeases (propitiates) Him by the presence of the flesh which He took unto Him. He sprinkles the altar as long as He renews the diminished number of the angels. He sprinkles the outer sanctuary, while He sanctifies [*i.e.* justifies] men [properly makes them holy, *i.e.* accepted as such] and reconciles them while they are on earth to the Father. The priest sprinkles them because this sacrifice propitiates God and obtains for them pardon, (for) in this (latter) way also He sprinkles it over such. But He sprinkles the inner tabernacle as has been said in the preceding clause (or

---

veraciter incipiunt esse sub illis, ita quod sub eisdem accidentibus utrumque vere suscipitur: scilicet panis et caro vinum et sanguis quorum alterum probat sensus: reliquum credit fides...Berengarius' confession to Pope Nicholas.. Si vero quæretur quid a mure comeditur dum sacramentum comeditur, vel quid incineratur dum sacramentum crematur, respondet ipse Innocentius, quod sicut miraculose substantia panis convertitur in corpus Domini cum incipit esse sub sacramento, sic quodammodo miraculose revertitur, cum ipsum ibi desinit esse, non quod illa panis substantia revertatur quæ transivit in carnem sed ejus loco aliquid miraculose creatur, &c. [How much of this does Durandus accept for true?]

C. XLIV. p. 179.

Pontifex, ut lex jubebat...aspergebat tabulam et aram et exterius sacrum sanguine pacifico. Et Christus toties aspergit Patrem sanguine, quoties Eum placat per carnem assumptam. Aram aspergit quamdiu numerum restaurat angelorum. Exterius sacrum aspergit dum homines sanctificat, et Patri, qui in terris sunt, reconciliat. Sacerdos eosdem aspergit quia hoc sacrificium placat Deum et veniam impetrat et sic etiam super hos aspergit. Aspergit autem intus tabernaculum, prout



portion). But whilst the writer (Moses) names the high altar he commemorates by it the (heavenly) holy of holies." [The brazen altar in the court of the congregation was sprinkled in the day of atonement with blood from the slain goat and bullock. The ark was not an altar, nor does Moses call it sublime altar, or altar at all.]

---

in præcedente particulâ dictum est. Dum autem hic nominat sublime altare, commemorat sancta sanctorum.

(K.) DUNS SCOTUS (PROPERLY JOHN OF DUNSTAN, IN NORTHUMBERLAND). B. 1265. D. 1308.

He is the great antagonist of Thomas Aquinas, both as taking the Nominalist side of the question of universals, or as we say of general ideas, and as being a Franciscan ; whereas Aquinas was a Realist and a Dominican. He was followed by a very stiff reasoner, also from Great Britian, William Occam, who attacked the political side of Papal Supremacy. The name of Duns is an abbreviation for Dunstane, his birthplace in Northumberland. It is so recorded in the Merton College Library manuscript of his works. Scotus was sent to Oxford by a college of Minim monks at Newcastle. He passed through as full a training as Merton College in Oxford could supply, and then proceeded to lecture at Paris ; and borne up by his powerful order and his own "most "subtil" intellect, he surpassed the best of the existing Dominicans and reigned supreme at the Sorbonne as Professor and Regent of the theological school. He, like Albertus Magnus, died at Cologne. He was the last of the giants in scholasticism with their gigantic arrays of many folio volumes. But his are but 12 folios. Perhaps this is a good place to insert a translation of Lord Bacon's judgment upon them in his preface to his *Novum Organon*. "The "dialectic art coming to man's aid too late and not able to rally "our broken forces, spent its strength rather in making mistaken "discoveries, than in opening truth to mankind." Possibly Bacon might find "*doctrinæ inquinatæ*" and "*vanissima idola*" in our doctrinal horizon. Duns wrote his Commentary on Lombard while he was at Oxford.

It is related by William Vorill that he witnessed the following encounter of wits between Duns and a Scotsman in England, to

which Duns was paying a visit. The North country peasant, with that excess of predestinarian proclivities which is perhaps now at length dying out in the country, remonstrated against some religious appeal that Duns made to him. "Why," said he, "talk so to me? If God has foreseen that I shall be saved, I shall infallibly be saved, let me do well or ill; but if He has foreseen my damnation, nothing can preserve me from it." The answer of Duns was, "If God does all that you think in the way of irrevocable necessity, why do you sow the ground? If God has foreseen that corn will grow here, it will push forth, whether you sow or not. If He has foreseen that it will not, your labour is useless." Duns is credited with having given a general check to the system of Aquinas, which had by this time become almost universal. The doctrine of the immaculate conception is attributed to him; but it is traceable in one of Bernard's letters. The almost frozen coolness of his mind comes out in a little word of his. He was with a party of pleasure-takers when the general's order to go to Cologne to dispute with the Beghards was delivered to him. He turned to set out immediately. "Will you not go to the house," said one, "and say farewell?" His reply was, "The general orders me to go to Cologne, but there is no word about going to my house first." He used Aristotle less than his precursors.

P. 566. "Whether the sacraments of the new law have an active causality in relation to grace. In one of the collects, it is said, 'May the sacraments accomplish in us, O Lord, what they contain.' But sacraments do not contain (grace) really; they contain it virtually [i.e. by having a virtue, to give it] as a cause contains the end, by having a virtue to accomplish it. Also, if the sacraments of the new law do not give grace, unless because God gives grace to those that use them, then a sacrament does not of its own strength justify ... and then they are not different from the

---

*Vol. XI. Part II., Qu. III. p. 566. Lugduni, 1689.*

Utrum sacramenta novæ legis habeant causalitatem activam respectu gratiæ? In quadam collectâ dicitur "Perficient in nobis, Domine, sacramenta quod continent." Sed sacramenta non continent realiter; ... continent eam virtualiter, *sicut causa continet effectum* in sua virtute... Item si sacramenta novæ legis non dent gratiam, nisi quia ea suscipientibus *Deus det gratiam*; tunc ex vi sacramentum non justificat ... et tunc non differre a sacramentis veteris legis. *Ergo videtur quod*

sacraments of the old law. Therefore it seems that they produce that grace which they confer ... From Augustine. So great is the virtue of the water that it touches the body and washes the heart clean, &c. ... but this is only by conferring grace, &c. ... It is competent to God alone to illuminate souls ; but souls are illuminated by grace ; therefore He Himself alone causes it in the soul... Whether there is any supernatural force (in sacraments) which is in any way a cause of grace in the soul. It is argued that there is not. Against it. It does not wash the soul clean except by bringing in grace. Further, The medicine of the soul itself is spiritual. But medicine has some virtue for healing. Otherwise it were not medicine. Further, &c. [It is notable how near this scholastic philosopher comes to the pure Bible truth that sacraments do not carry, convey or confer grace, but solely lead and help us to seek and obtain it from God Himself. Scholastic philosophers are not to be cast away.] The water and the word as they have regard to the rightness of the sacrament have in respect of unseen and imperceptible grace the relation of a perceptible sign. Therefore some absolute virtue is required in them in respect of creating new grace. Opinions of the Divine Thomas. Scholium I. That they (the sacraments) are causes of grace because they instrumentally and physically cause not grace itself but *the disposition preparatory to it*. [Just the truth as it appears to me.] It is said, They have some efficacy of themselves in respect of grace, because there would not otherwise have been (any) causes of grace, except subordinate causes, without which the thing could not be. This is inconsistent. For the definition of a sacrament is a visible form of an invisible grace, to generate a likeness (of mind) to the grace and to exist as a cause. This suggests that

---

gratiam illam quam conferunt efficiant. [A curious inference.] Item Aug.... Tanta est virtus aquæ ut corpus tangat et cor abluit, &c. ... sed hoc non est nisi conferendo gratiam, &c.... Item Aug. Soli Deo convenit illuminare animas ; sed animæ illuminantur per gratiam, ergo Ipse solus causat in animâ... Qn. 4. Utrum insit aliqua virtus supernaturalis quæ sit aliquo modo causa gratiæ in animâ. Arguitur quod non. Contra, non abluit animam (Aug.) nisi inducendo gratiam. Item, Est medicina spiritualis ipsius animæ. Sed medicina habet aliquam virtutem ad sanandum. Aliter non esset medicina. Item... Aqua et verbum ut concernunt rectitudinem sacramenti habent relationem signi sensibilis respectu gratiæ invisibilis et insensibilis. Ergo requiritur in eis aliqua virtus absoluta novæ respectu gratiæ creandæ. Adducit sententias D. Thom ... Scholium I. Esse causas gratiæ, quia instrumentaliter et physice causant *non ipsam gratiam* sed dispositionem ejus præviam. 1. Dicitur, Aliquam *per se* efficaciam habent respectu gratiæ, quia aliter non essent causæ gratiæ nisi causæ sine quibus non. Hoc est inconveniens. Definitio enim sacramenti... est invisibilis gratiæ visibilis forma, ut gratiæ similitudinem generet et causa existat. Hoc innuit, aliter

otherwise all is false. But they distinguish an efficient cause. There is an efficient disposing, an efficient accomplishing cause. Nor does it attain grace of its own action as a principal, or instrumentally: but it is an acting cause disposing to grace, and this not by a virtue belonging to it, but in virtue of a principal acting cause, (itself) attaining and inducing a certain disposition in the soul towards the laying hold of grace...in a certain way compelling of necessity the laying hold of grace and its infusion into the mind. [This makes the sacrament efficient in all cases. We see daily abundant crowds of cases that disprove such an assertion.]... There is some virtue inhering in it in respect of the creating of grace (in the soul), and that virtue is a thing of an absolute character not simply in respect (of the action of others)... This virtue cannot be relative, because it is neither the beginning nor the end of an action. Therefore it is an absolute cause. But if you ask of what kind that cause is, not fixed and quiet as of a principal acting cause, but after the manner of an instrumental agent in continual flow: and that so it is. Scholium II. It impugns the meaning of Divine Thomas that a disposition towards grace is as much an end of the creating as the grace itself: but a creature cannot create. The effect is caused when the sacrament itself is ended; therefore the grace is not caused by it as by a physical action... Schol. III. He refutes another of the scholia of Aquinas, as far as he places a supernatural virtue in the sacrament. IV. It causes grace in part—in those that put no obstacle (infants chiefly). V. The ultimate virtue of the power of a practical sign, *i.e.* to signify, is effected, *i.e.* that it always and certainly has the effect which it

---

esse falsa. Sed distinguunt causam efficientem...efficiens disponens...efficiens perficiens; nec principaliter nec instrumentaliter *attingit gratiam actione sua*: sed est agens disponens ad gratiam et hoc non virtute propria, sed in virtute principalis agentis attingens et inducens quamdam dispositionem in animâ ad gratiæ susceptionem...quodammodo *necessitans* ad gratiæ susceptionem et infusionem. [This word *necessitans* is discordant.] Qn. II. Est aliqua virtus inhærens respectu gratiæ creandæ, et ista virtus est aliquid absolutum non respectu... Hæc virtus non potest esse relatio, quia nec est principium actionis nec terminus. Ergo est aliquid absolutum... Sed si quæris qualis sit ista virtus, non fixa et quæta sicut principalis agentis, sed per modum instrumentalis agentis in continuo fluxu: et "feri." [So the proposition is denied.] Scholium II. Impugnat sensum D. Thomæ quia dispositio ad gratiam est terminus creationis sicut ipsa gratia; sed...creatura creare non potest. Effectus causatur quando ipsum desinit; ergo non physice ab ipso causatur, &c. Schol. III. IV. and V. follow II. Schol. Refutat D. Thom. quatenus virtutem ponit supernaturalem in sacramento. IV. Ex parte causare gratiam in non ponente obicem. V. Virtus ultima potentie signi practici, *i.e.* significare efficitur, *i.e.* semper et certo habere effectum quem significat, quantum est ex se. [These two last

signifies, *as far as* it comes *from itself*. Not any absolute virtue, but only a sign effectually representing the principal form and its own signified sacrament; and whoever receives it unfeignedly becomes a friend of God and is accepted by God through grace, and God assists those, that that, which it marks, may be in it. [Does not this deserve something better than Lord Bacon's sweeping rebuke? Is there no glimpse of truth beyond what shone out before?]

P. 589. "Of the substance of the soul. Without a bodily form the truth of the eucharist is not secured. Without a form it cannot truly be said, 'This is My body.' When it is said, This is My blood, it cannot be pretended that only the material of blood is there, or material in a quantitative mode, therefore the same is to be said in this case. 'This is My body' is not laid down as detracting from the truth of flesh, bones, &c. Against. It is impossible that an unextended form should give a 'being' extended in a formal manner. The presence of Christ's soul is not laid down under the appearance of bread or wine, by the force of the words, but only by the force of the natural connexion with body and blood ... Therefore by the force of (those) words now as then a true body is declared (laid down) under the forms of bread (and wine) and by consequence a most true body distinct from the soul ... That the body of Christ was not the same body alive and dead. It would have another form different in appearance or (even) kind after death. A falsity. Ambrose and Leo. A caution. That the body of Christ is to be eaten alive or dead, but not in the way of form. Against. It is not the same if it is in substance

---

words are what Bucer so well denies.] Non aliqua virtus absoluta, sed solum signum, efficaciter repræsentans formam principalem et suum signatum; et quicumque id recipiat sine fictione fit amicus Dei et accipitur a Deo per gratiam, et illos assistit Deus, ut insit quod designat.

*Vol. II. p. 589. De animæ subs. disp. § 4.*

Sine formâ corporeitatis non salvatur veritas eucharistiæ. Sine formâ non vere dicitur, Hoc est corpus Meum. Quando dicitur, Hic est sanguis Meus, non potest fingi ibi tantum esse materiam solam sanguinis vel materiam eam modo quantitativo, ergo idem hic dicendum. "Hoc est," &c., non ponitur distrahens a veritate carnis ossis, &c. Contra. Impossibile quod forma inextensa det esse extensum formaliter. Non ponitur anima sub specie panis vel vini ex vi verborum, sed tantum ex vi naturalis connexionis cum corpore et sanguine... Ergo ex vi verborum nunc sicut et tunc ponitur verum corpus sub speciebus panis et per consequens verissimum corpus ab animâ distinctum. [The premiss draws all after it.]... Corpus Christi non esset idem vivum et mortuum. Haberet aliam formam specie vel genere distinctam post mortem. *Falsitas. Amb. Leo.* Cavet. Corpus Christi vivum et mortuum esse edendum, non autem formaliter. Contra.

changed into another form. Conclusion. That no substance is produced *de novo* in an animal's death. That the same form remains ... the same accidents; it must be held that the same spirit remains, because there is nothing in this case which compels us to correct the evidence of the senses ... Suarez. The generation of one thing is the corruption of another. He himself pretends that (John) Scotus pretends there are new forms, when Scotus denies that bread is flesh.

P. 498. "If you ask, Why the apostles themselves did not place the mystery of the eucharist in their creed, since, as I said before, it is more necessary and useful to salvation than other mysteries that they placed in that creed? I answer, In my judgment the reason is, since they daily attain to Him [unless you read 'id,' *it*] and it was commemorated by the faithful (thus) [I should like to read 'erat quotidie consequutum']: there was no danger that it should be forgotten: and thus there was no necessity to entrust it to the memory in a creed: as neither were other things a sacrament, baptisms, confession, orders, &c. (The church) willed to place in the creed the mysteries removed from the senses, which men could easily forget, if they were not put forward to be committed to memory by men themselves.

P. 523. "It does not seem more impossible that Christ's body should be with the one than with the other. Therefore it is not more repugnant that it should be with the substance of bread than

Non est idem si mutatum in aliam formam substantialiter. Conclusio. Nullam substantiam de novo in interitu animalis produci. Manere eandem formam...eadem accidentia. Tenendum est manere eundem spiritum, quia nihil est quod cogit in hoc corrigere sensum. Suarez. Generatio unius est corruptio alterius. Ipse fingit Scotum fingere novas formas, cum panem carnem neget Scotus. [More worthy of rebuke.]

VII. p. 498, Part I. Lib. III. *Sententiarum Disp. XXV. XXVI.*

Si quæras, cur ipsi apostoli non posuerunt in symbolo suo mysterium eucharistiæ, quod, ut jam dixi, magis necessarium et utile est ad salutem quam alia mysteria in symbolo posita? Respondeo meo iudicio rationem esse, quando quidem eum quotidie consequuntur et commemoratum fidelibus, non erat periculum ut ejus oblivisceretur; et sic non erat necesse ut in symbolo memoriæ commendaretur; sicut nec alia sacramentum, baptismi, confessio, ordines, &c. Solo in symbolo ponere volebat mysteria remota a sensibus quorum facile oblivisci potuerunt homines si non proponerentur ipsis memoriæ commendanda.

Vol. V. p. 523.

Non magis impossibile videtur corpus Christi esse cum illo quam cum isto. Ergo non magis repugnat esse cum substantiâ panis quam

with mere quantity, &c. and thus of everything (accident) besides... and then further. But if it can be otherwise than where it is under the mode not natural to itself, surely then also under the natural." [It is singular that a scholastic philosopher who was almost the last of their company had not suspected or discovered that there is no ground for believing that the Apostles' Creed was composed anywhere near the apostles' time, or that daily communion was practised anything like as early as the first century.]

---

cum quantitate, &c., et sic de quocunque alio... et tunc ultra. Si potest autem esse aliter quam ubi est sub modo non naturali sibi, ergo et sub naturali. [But we deny both in this world now. *Note.* It is curious how many of the Latin phrases and words in these extracts have with slight or no modification of their senses come into vernacular English, e.g. "concernere" to look to, gives us the word "what concerns us;" and then the substantive "our concerns."]

(L.) NICEPHORUS BLEMMDAS. FL. 1250.

He is one of those in whom the essential spirit of the received formula, "Nolo episcopari," was exhibited. In 1255, forty years after Innocent III.'s great transubstantiation council, he a simple presbyter and monk received from John Theodore Ducas Lascaris the emperor an offer of the metropolitan patriarchate, and he thought it his duty to decline it. He stands out in no doubtful colours in another remarkable way, which the world can ill afford to forget. The charms of a woman who had abandoned virtue had so fascinated and shall we say "had so besotted" the emperor, that as in other instances of similar royal moral infatuation she ruled at court over everybody. Her name was Marchesina. In the fulness of her confidence she presented herself to receive the sacred bread and wine at the chapel of the convent, of which Blemmidas was abbot. We keep his first name Nicephorus for another man. He without real hesitation, through a deep sense of what was involved in such a step, refused her, and constrained her to withdraw. Some of the expressions he uses in his self-justificatory letter are extracted to carry on the representation of the views prevalent in the East at this critical time. He wrote on the Procession of the Spirit, but in behalf of the Western view, as also did Veccus, another Eastern star. He also wrote epitomes of logic, physics, and against Plotinus, the Neo-Platonist, on the soul. He wrote also on the Psalms and John, and on geography, medicine, &c.

P. 1101. "The princess (*i.e.* of the court) Marchesina tyrannically stole into the venerable monastery of St Gregory Thaumaturge, where we were living, and also entered into God's temple, while the sacrifice of the mass was proceeding, and she was put out by us from the sacred assembly and with disgrace driven away... That execrable woman streamed in with all her train and into the very temple while the Divine and mystic sacrifice was being fulfilled... We put out our whole force and cast out the profane woman from the sacred places. For he that studies to please man is not Christ's servant, and unto them, regarding whom all men speak right things, the true word 'Woe' is assigned. And although the opinion of many is not the same as ours, nevertheless we are taught neither to envy them that do wickedly nor to imitate them that work iniquity. And if those who do so are (our) fathers (yet) they must be neglected and Christ must be followed. We must adhere to His footsteps and depend on His justifying (sufferings). For he who does not work in this way is not worthy of Christ. Relying on thoughts like these we straightway thrust out the impious woman from the sacred temple and did not dare to exhibit the holy bread to an immodest and unclean person nor to utter the words of the sacred sacrifice, splendid as they are and spotless as pearls, in the presence of one that continually wallows in the mud and filth of adultery. Wherefore we (will) endure what attacks are made upon us in consequence and what punishments we have to suffer."

*Epistola de Marchesina. Opera, Migne, Vol. LXXI. p. 1101.*

Principem Marchesinam ... tyrannice in venerandum Sancti Gregorii Thaumaturgi monasterium ubi nos degebamus irrepsisse, introisse etiam in Dei templum, cum sacrificium missæ fieret, et exclusam fuisse per nos a sacrâ auditione atque cum dedecore fugatam ... Cum omni apparatu et in ipsum templum, dum Divinum ac mysticum sacrificium conficiebatur [Jerome's word, eight centuries earlier] execrabilis illa influxit ... Nos ... totis conatibus e sacris locis profanam ejicimus ... Qui enim studet ut hominibus placeat servus Christi non est: et de quibus omnes homines recta enuntiant; illis verus sermo "Væ" impertitus. Et licet multorum non eadem est ac nostri sententia, veruntamen neque malitiose facientes æmulari docemur, neque imitari operantes iniquitatem. Et, si hi patres sunt, negligendi sunt, sectandusque est Christus. Illius vestigiis inhærendum est; ex Illius justificationibus dependendum. [An Eastern Luther!] Namque qui non operatur hoc modo, dignus Christo non est. His freti cogitationibus statim e sacris ædibus impiam pellimus, neque sanctum panem inverecundæ atque immundæ exhibere ausi sumus, neque ante volutantem sese continuo in cæno ac adulterii sordibus splendida et instar margaritarum candida sacrosancti sacrificii verba mittere. Quare in Domino quæ nobis inferuntur danturque sustinemus.



## (M.) JOHANNES DE PARISIIS. D. 1306.

He is the originator of the theory called the impanation of Christ. Objecting to the belief of the change of the subject or substance of the bread while its sensible qualities remained, he took the theory of what might be termed bi-substantiation, *viz.* that both substances or, as he expresses it, both the corporeities, are there: or, to express it otherwise, the paneity of the bread is mutually united with the corporeity of Christ's body. But what does he gain by this? He has still the substance or corporeity of Christ's body there without any of its own sensible properties: so that his invention reminds one of Burke's saying of Godwin's Political Philosophy, What is true in his theory is old, and what is new is wrong. But this may be said of transubstantiation also and of all the varieties of human invention. The Master's sayings are the old and the true. Yet his followers were so proud of his intelligence as to give him a nickname not complimentary to his opponents, *viz.* Johannes pungens asinum. It sounds worse in French. However, it must be allowed that his opinions did in some points lean over to what were called in the German Reformation Sacramentarian opinions, *i.e.* laying more stress on the sacrament being a fruitful SIGN of spiritual feeding upon Christ than was palatable at Rome. But just as might have been expected from Paris being the centre of discussion, Gieseler in a note about this author says from Bulæus that the court of Rome suspected many of the Parisian professors of heretical leanings on the Lord's supper, and John's licence to preach and teach was taken away. He appealed to Rome against the sentence and went thither and died there not long after his arrival.

*On Christ's body's mode of existence in the sacrament of the altar being different from that which the church holds—now first published from the parchment MS of the school of S. Victor in Paris, to which is prefixed a historical preface on the dogma of Transubstantiation by P. Allix. London, 1686.*

---

*De modo existendi corporis Christi in sacramento altaris alio quam sit ille quem tenet ecclesia, nunc primum edita ex MS. codice S. Victoris, Paris, cui præfixa est præfatio historica de dogmate Transubstantiationis scripta per P. Allix. London, 1686. Camb. Univ. Lib. Bb. 12. 1.*

P. 86. "First, that there are two ways of understanding that the substance of the bread remains under its own accidents in the sacrament of the altar. In one mode thus—that the substance of the bread in the sacrament of the altar remains under its own accidents in its own subject-matter: but that would be false, because there would not be any communication of particular properties between the bread and Christ's body, nor would it be true to say 'Bread is Christ's body,' nor 'My flesh is truly meat' [This was probably the belief of not a few before a *bonâ fide* change of the substance of the bread, &c. into Christ's body, &c. came to be the generally received idea ages and ages before 1215.]... In another way—that the substance of bread remains under its own accidents not in its own subject-matter, but *drawn to* the 'being' (essence) and subject-matter of Christ's (body), so that there is *one subject-matter to the two natures* [This is John of Paris' doctrine of Impanation, treated of in the third creed as a confusion of substances]; that is to say, two corporal natures of bread and (Christ's) humanity: but it makes there only one body—because a body and a bodily nature are not the same, but a body is that which has a bodily nature (corporeity)—because there is (in this case only) one subject-matter. Secondly. One thing can be understood to be drawn to the 'essence' of another mediately (*i.e.* indirectly) or immediately (*i.e.* directly). I say that bread in the sacrament of the altar is drawn to the 'essence' or subject-matter of the Word not directly but through the medium of the bodily nature... If the nature of bread (paneity) is taken to itself by the subject-matter of the Word, the peculiar properties (accidents) of both communicate with one another and will be predicated of both in turn (flesh and bread), so that bread is Christ's body and

P. 86.

Primo, quod substantiam panis manere sub suis accidentibus in sacramento altaris dupliciter potest intelligi. Uno modo sic quod substantia panis in sacramento altaris sub suis accidentibus maneat in proprio supposito: sed istud esset falsum, quia non esset communicatio idiomatum inter panem et corpus Christi, nec esset verum dicere, "Panis est corpus Christi," nec "Caro mea vere est cibus"... Alio modo ut substantia panis maneat sub accidentibus suis non in proprio supposito, sed *tracta* ad esse et suppositum Christi, ut sic sit unum suppositum in duabus naturis... duas corporeitates scilicet panis et humanitatis: sed tantum ponit ibi unum corpus, quia corpus non est corporeitas, sed habens corporeitatem, quia ibi est unum suppositum tantum. Secundo. Aliud trahi potest alterius potest intelligi mediate vel immediate. Dico quod panis in sacramento altaris trahitur ad esse vel suppositum Verbi non immediate; sed mediante corporeitate... Si paneitas assumatur a supposito Verbi, communicant sibi sua idiomata et prædicabuntur de se invicem (caro et panis) ut panis est corpus Christi

conversely. Thirdly. The body is spoken of in one way, as being an individual, in another as being a genus... Christ said that He is bread metaphorically, as before also, John iv., Christ said that he was water *metaphorically* and therefore there was no communication of properties between the bread taken to Him and Christ, *i.e.* the man. [This phrase—communication of properties or having accidents in common—is an usual name for these views of John of Paris. The discussion is not made clearer by introducing ‘the Word’ into it, where previously he had put the body, *i.e.* the human body of Christ.] He received flesh as part, because His flesh was truly a part of bread, and conversely, by communication of properties... so that the bread was flesh, *i.e.* Christ’s body, and conversely, and the double substance communicates to itself its own properties... Fourthly. The ancient holy fathers and modern doctors all still bear witness to this opinion. [This John is not a fair or true reasoner. Many fathers wrote in express denial of it. Those that said that the substance of bread remained may be assumed to be on his side.] In presence of &c., &c. it was said [the council] holds both methods of laying down that the body of Christ is on the altar. It holds for probable and approves both... Yet it says that no mode has been determined by the church and therefore none falls under the (category of) faith; and if it had spoken otherwise it would have spoken less well, and they who speak otherwise speak less well; and the man who should assert that one of the two falls precisely under the (definition of) faith would incur condemnation by the canon at least if not by anathema.” [These views are marked by an authoritative imprimatur on their being printed, as stated above.]

[On the whole this writer is against the adoption of transubstantiation as the faith. He thinks impanation equally orthodox.]

et e contrario. Tertio. Uno modo dicitur corpus quod est pars, alio modo corpus quod est genus... Dixit Se Christus panem metaphorice, sicut et prius, Johan. iv. dixit Se aquam metaphorice; et idcirco non est communicatio idiomatum inter panem assumptum et Christum sive hominem... Accepit carnem pro parte, quia caro sua pars vere est panis, et e contrario, per communicationem idiomatum... ut panis esset caro aut corpus Christi et e contrario et communicat sibi sua idiomata... Quarto. Antiqui sancti et doctores moderni adhuc omnes huic opinioni attestantur... In præsentia coll. m<sup>m</sup>. in T. dictum est utrumque modum ponendi corpus Christi esse in altari, tenet pro opinione probabili, et approbat utrumque... Dicit tamen quod nullus est determinatus per ecclesiam, et idcirco nullus cadit sub fide, et si aliter dixisset minus bene dixisset, et qui aliter dicunt minus bene dicunt, et qui determinate asserat, alterum præcise eadem sub fide, incurreret sententiam canonis vel anathematis.

Imprimatur Maii 12, 1686. H. Maurice P. P. et D. Wmu. Arch. Cant. a sacris.

The former is perhaps the preferable in appearance at least, and it is less opposed certainly to the received laws of natural philosophy, and so the Western churches have decided the matter. Both alternatives however oppose all received laws, as the Reformers have abundantly urged against the successful theory, *i.e.* transubstantiation. The more proper title for John of Paris to have adopted is consubstantiation—though not in the sense in which the German Reformers badly used it. Concomitance seems to be the word for them: but it had been taken to represent another doctrine, *viz.* that he that eats the bread has the blood of Christ as well as the body, and conversely.]

(N.) MARSILIUS OF PADUA. D. 1328.

The great work of this physician-in-ordinary to the emperor, Louis of Bavaria, is no longer unknown. Gieseler, Neander and Milman have made its name and its principles familiar to everyone. It has certainly a singular name, The defender of peace (Defensor Pacis). For when he went down with his master's Ghibelline forces to Rome this book was by no means the least powerful of the engines of war that were taken down into Italy. The dogmas involve the most momentous issues ever raised between the Pope and earthly sovereigns, regarding which innumerable wars have arisen, and from which, if we read aright the signs of the times, more general struggles will yet spring. If so, it might be said that never was a book written to which might more justly be applied the Divine form of words, It came not to send peace but a sword. It were a needless consumption of space to give here one more synopsis of its teaching. Fritz in the Dictionnaire Encyclopédique, and Milman, in his Latin Christianity, give popular summaries, and Gieseler renders a more exact account. He had for colleague in the maintenance of his views John of Janduno, Professor of Theology and Philosophy in the University of Paris. The French Dictionnaire Universel makes Marsilius Rector of that University: which would account for Janduno's support of his views. Fritz also denies that he was Rector of the Vienna University. It is somewhat singular that he and his colleague united very high doctrinal views on the Lord's supper and the clerical power of changing its elements

with such staunch denials of all supremacy in the person of the pope. In fact this work of his deserves close comparison with the treatise of Erastus: for Marsilius has much more of what people in this day mistakenly mean by Erastianism. One would suppose Erastus to have taken this work as a starting-point, and from it to have run into his own denial of any excommunicating power except towards those who did not hold the great doctrines. Marsilius, on the other hand, lodges the power in the people or church, not in the clergy, and devolves on the civil ruler an amount of supremacy which nothing can explain, as a product of the 13th and 14th centuries, except his position at the court of this Louis during the peculiarly inveterate struggle between him and Pope John XXII. of Avignon, the millionaire and opponent of Franciscan poverty.

The title-page of the *Defensor Pacis* has no date, no name of publisher, nor place of publication. But underneath a kind of explanation given instead of the usual title\* is a picture occupying two-thirds of the page, representing a city with the name ROMA above it, and a monarch, with his men of war, sitting outside, with a scroll, under a two-headed eagle, inscribed in Latin, Imp. Cæs.—Ludovicus Quartus. A preface follows in which the book is termed, An apology (defence) for the Bavarian Louis emperor of the Romans by the priest Licentius Evangelus. And the preface is dated, A.D. 1522. It fills 10 folio pages.

\* Opus insigne, cui titulum fecit autor, "Defensorem Pacis," quia quæstionem illam, jam olim controversam, de potestate papæ et imperatoris excussissime tractet, &c., scriptum quidem ante annos ducentos, &c., at nunc in lucem primum editum, &c.

P. 74. "*On the causes that produce tranquillity, &c.* Christ determined I say that a gospel law should be put together in writing by these apostles, whose names are well known among Christ's faithful, and by certain others: and by their own dictating as by certain instruments, moved to this end, under the direct influence of Divine power, have these things been written, if so be that by this law we might be able, in the absence of Christ

---

*Prima dictio seu pars. Cap. XIX. p. 74, leaf h. De causis  
factivis tranquillitatis, &c.*

Per hos inquam apostolos, quorum nomina satis nota sunt inter Christi fideles, et alios quosdam, Christus legem evangelicam conscribi voluit; et per ipsorum dictamina conscripta sunt, velut per organa quædam, ad hoc mota et directa immediate Divinâ virtute, per quam siquidem legem precepta et consilia salutis æternæ in Ipsius Christi

and His apostles and evangelists, to comprehend the precepts and counsels of eternal salvation. And in this law and according to it he marked with signs and established sacraments, for the cleansing away of original and actual sin, for the production and preservation of Divine grace, and for the reproduction of it when lost, and for the institution of this law's ministers. He also instituted the forenamed apostles first as teachers of this law and of the sacraments according thereto, conferring on them through the Holy Spirit that authority over this mystery, which is called sacerdotal by the faithful people of Christ. And by this indeed he conferred on themselves or their successors in this office, and on no other, the power of transubstantiating bread and wine into His own true body and blood in the use of a set form of words spoken by themselves and by each one of them. With this He also conceded to themselves the power of releasing and binding men as to their sins, which men are wont to call the power of the keys, and of substituting others into their own place with the same authority. And this authority also the apostles did confer on some, or God did this through them, when they prayed and put their hands upon others. In this way also the rest took up the power of doing the same, and in sequence did so, do so, and will do so, till the consummation of the age...And this is the authority of priests and of the keys, be it one or more, a certain mark or form, left on the soul by the immediate action of God.

[The next paragraph concerns the authority of one chief among the priests constituted by man's will to direct the multitude of priests in Divine worship.]

---

atque apostolorum et evangelistarum absentiam comprehendere valeremus. In qua etiam et secundum quam sacramenta, culpae originalis et actualis mundativa, Divinae gratiae factiva et conservativa, illiusque amissionis reformativa, huiusque legis ministrorum institutiva signavit et statuit. Huius quoque legis doctores et sacramentorum secundum ipsam ministros primum instituit jam dictos apostolos, ipsis per Spiritum sanctum auctoritatem huius mysterii conferens, quam sacerdotalem appellant Christi fideles. Per quam siquidem iisdem aut ipsorum successoribus in hoc officio, non aliis, potestatem contulit sub certa forma verborum ab ipsis et eorum singulis dicta transubstantiandi panem et vinum in verum corpus et sanguinem Ejus. Cum hoc etiam ipsis auctoritatem solvendi atque ligandi homines a peccatis, quam dicere solent clavium potestatem, sibi et alios substituendi cum eadem auctoritate, concessit. Quam etiam auctoritatem apostoli quibusdam contulerunt, aut Deus per ipsos orantes et manus aliis imponentes. Sic quoque reliqui potestatem faciendi susceperunt et consequenter fecerunt, faciunt, et facient, usque ad saeculi consummationem 1 Tim. iv., Titus i. ... Et est haec auctoritas sacerdotalis et clavium, sive unica sive plures, character seu forma quaedam, animae per immediatam Dei actionem impressa.

P. 122. "*What kind of power a priest or a bishop has in excommunicating...* It is to be said that, though to promulgate such judgment the word and acting of a priest be (alone) required, yet it does not pertain to one alone or only to the priestly college to put compulsory judgment in force, and to utter a precept regarding those that are to be excommunicated or absolved; but to rule such a judgment, in pursuance of which the accused may be cited, examined, judged, absolved or condemned (that thus he may be publicly made known or cut off from the company of the faithful), that this belongs to the entire community of the faithful in that society, in which a man ought to be judged with such judgment, either (to lead) to his own superior or to general exile. [What does this mean?]

P. 125. "But priests have a certain committed authority of such a nature that bread and wine are transubstantiated into Christ's blessed body at a priest's prayer after he has uttered certain words. But this authority is a mark set upon the soul, as is that of the keys: and it is called the power of making the sacrament of the eucharist. *Some sins forgiven by God without the priest's agency and some not without it.*

P. 242. "And from this follows a desirable deduction, that to excommunicate or interdict from the use of religious offices a prince, a province, or any other civil community belongs only to

*Pars II. Cap. VI. p. 122.*

Qualem in excommunicando sacerdos aut episcopus habeat partem ... Dicendum quod, licet ad tale iudicium promulgandum requirantur vox et actio sacerdotis, non tamen ad aliquem solum aut tantummodo ad ipsorum collegium pertinet iudicium coactivum, et præceptum dare de excommunicandis aut absolvendis: sed talem statuere iudicem, cujus videlicet sit reum vocare ac examinare, iudicare, absolvere aut condemnare, sic publice diffamandum aut a fidelium consortio præcidendum, pertinet ad fidelium universitatem in communitate illâ, in quâ debet aliquis tali iudicio judicari vel ad superiorem ipsius vel ad exilium generale. See also p. 124.

*P. 125.*

Est autem autoritas quædam sacerdotum, ea quâ panis et vinum in corpus Christi benedictum transubstantiatur ad sacerdotis orationem post certorum verborum ab ipso prolationem. Hæc autem autoritas character est animæ, sicut ea quæ clavium: et dicitur potestas conficiendi eucharistiæ sacramentum.

*Pars II. C. XXII., p. 242.*

Ex quibus etiam deduci potest et convenit, ad solius jam dicti concilii non autem ad solius episcopi aut presbyteri vel alicujus ipsorum particularis collegii auctoritatem pertinere, principem, provinciam aut

the authority of such a council as was now spoken of, but not to the authority of any one bishop or presbyter, or to any one particular college of the clergy. [Then Boniface's bull, *Unam sanctam*, &c., is condemned.] The form of interdicts and excommunications of this kind ought to be left only to a general council of Christians, whose judgment, being under the direction of the Holy Spirit, cannot be perverted by ignorance or any malignity.

P. 120. "Priests also bind when they impose satisfying penance on the confessing sinners. They loose when they relax any part of it, or admit to participation in the sacraments those whom penance has purged. According to this mode, priests are said to remit or retain sins."

---

*communitatem aliam civilem excommunicare vel Divinorum officiorum usum interdicere ... Interdictorum et excommunicationum hujusmodi forma soli Christianorum generali concilio relinqui debet, cujus judicium, dirigente sancto Spiritu, ignorantia vel malignitate aliquâ perverti non potest.*

*Pars II. C. VI. p. 120.*

Ligant quoque sacerdotes dum satisfactionem pœnitentiæ confitentibus imponunt. Solvunt cum de eâ aliquid dimittunt, vel per eam purgatos ad communionem sacramentorum admittunt ... Secundum hunc modum dicuntur sacerdotes peccata dimittere vel retinere.



## THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY.

(A.) NICOLAS DE LYRA. D. 1340.

It is supposed that he was of Jewish descent; but his tomb gives no such intimation. He entered the order of St Francis in 1291; and as he is said to have been then very young, we can form a conjecture as to the time of his birth at Lyra, a village near Verneuil in the bishopric of Evreux. There is a tradition that his pious mother dedicated him to the service of God from his infancy. He studied at the convent of Verneuil with such success that the higher degree in theology was awarded, and he became a public teacher of it there. His virtues and his learning not only gained for him the dignity of provincial director of Burgundy, but this honour led to his being appointed an executor of the will of Jane, queen of Philip V. of France: but his great eminence consists in having been author of his famous commentary on the Scripture, which exceeds in piety, though it does not equal in learning or in fulness of discussion, that of Cornelius à Lapide. His commentary indeed is commonly stated to have been of the greatest service to Luther, and, together with the works of Wessel in the 15th century, to have been in a great degree the helpers, by whose aid that great German saw his way to the erection of an entire system of reformed doctrine. Everyone knows the couplet,

Si Lyra non lyrasset,  
Lutherus non saltasset;

*i.e.* Luther danced to Lyra's music.

As Lyra died at Paris in 1340, he was 49 years in the Franciscan Order. His epitaph declares that his renown had spread to all countries of the world (*climata mundi*). He is said to have begun his commentary upon Isaiah two years after his entry into

that order; and in 37 years, *i.e.* in 1330, the entire commentary was finished under the title of *Postilla* (Wycliffe used the same name, "postills," *post illa*) in *universa Biblia*. About a century later it was revised by Paul of Burgos, who was originally a Jew with the very Jewish name, Solomon Levi; who died in the seat of Patriarch of Aquileia in 1435. He added valuable notes to his copy of Lyra's commentary: but some have treated of his additions as depraving the doctrine of Lyra. Their names are Doring and Wadding. Lyra's work is by them set above that of à Lapide and all others. Calmet recites seven editions of it put forth in the 15th century alone. It has been translated into French and published at Paris, 1511. The edition of 1498 includes the additions of Paul and of Doring also. Lyra wrote among other works one on the body of Christ, one on the vision of God, and one on the Vulgate and its departures from the Hebrew text.

P. 79. "They received in the law that they should eat the flesh of the paschal lamb with unleavened loaves. Therefore in that last supper, in which He made His own body, there were unleavened loaves: and for this reason Matthew well writes what he writes, 'It was the first day of unleavened bread.' There is a discussion concerning John, who says that the Jews had not entered into the prætorium that they might not be prevented from eating the passover. It must be said that they mean by the passover not the paschal lamb which would have been slain the night before, but the unleavened loaves, which they used in seven days, to eat which a man was required to be clean [as much as to eat the lamb on the first evening]... The festivity began at the evening of the preceding day. For this reason they began on that very same day to eat unleavened loaves at even... John is not

---

*Comment. Vol. V. black letter, p. 79. C. Univ. Lib. Matt. XXVI.*

In lege percipiebant quod carnes agni paschalis comederent cum panibus azymis. Ergo in illâ cenâ ultimâ, in quâ confecit corpus Suum, erant panes azymi; et propter hoc bene scribit Mattheus quod scribit, "Prima dies azymorum." Arguunt de Johanne (xviii.) qui dicit quod Judæi non introierant prætorium, ne impedirentur a manducatione paschæ. Dicendum quod pascha accipiunt non pro agno paschali, qui fuerit immolatus nocte præcedenti, sed pro azymis panibus, quod utebantur septem diebus, ad quorum comestionem requirebant quod homo esset mundus. [It is curious how, without Lightfoot's knowledge of the Talmud and of the Chagiga, Lyra anticipated the substance of his discoveries!...] Festivitas incipiebat a vespere diei præcedentis. Propter hoc illâ eâdem die incipiebant comedere azymos panes in vespere...

speaking contrary to the other (evangelists) but rather is agreeing with them... The typical passover had been fulfilled, and He had eaten the lamb's flesh with His disciples. He takes bread... He brake it, to shew that the breaking of His own body would not be without His own voluntary will. He blessed the loaves because He filled the (human) nature that He took to Him with the concurrence of the Father and the Holy Ghost, with the grace of Divine virtue. He gave His body in the supper because it was needful that a typical passover should be consummated with bread, and thus sacraments of the true passover should afterward be substituted for it. But we in reverence of so great a sacrament refresh ourselves with the sacred rites of the Lord's passion before we take bodily food... But when evening was come, because that was the hour of eating the paschal lamb: and yet He did not repel Judas from the banquet of the paschal lamb, although his treason did not escape His notice.

P. 50. 1 Cor. xi. "After the old passover was celebrated, the Lord gave His own flesh and blood to His disciples, to shew that the old sacred testaments were about to cease... He handed it down under another form, and instituted it to be received henceforward by the faithful, because faith has no merit, if human reason approves of that which tries it... The bread has reference to the body, wine to the soul, because wine makes blood (in the body) and blood is the seat of the life... 'He brake,' not before he uttered the words of consecration, but afterwards. Therefore

---

Johannes non contradicit aliis, sed magis convenit cum eis... Typicum pascha fuerat impletum, et agni carnes cum apostolis comederat. Assumit panem... Fregit, ut ostendat corporis Sui fractionem non sine Suâ sponte fore. Benedixit panibus, quod naturam, quam assumpsit cum Patre et Spiritu Sancto, gratiâ Divinæ virtutis implevit. Ideo per cenam corpus Suum dedit, quia necesse erat pascha typicum panibus consummari, et sic veri paschæ sacramenta post substitui. Nos vero pro reverentiâ tanti sacramenti prius reficimur Dominicæ passionis sacris quam corporalibus escis... Vespere autem facto, quod illa erat hora comedendi agnum paschalem. Et tamen illum (Judam) non repulit a convivio agni paschalis, licet ejus perditio non lateret Eum.

*Vol. VI. p. 50, 1 Cor. XI.*

Post celebratum vetus pascha Dominus carnem et sanguinem Suum discipulis dedit, ut ostenderet vetera testamenta sacra cessatura... Sub aliâ specie tradidit et deinceps a fidelibus sumendum instituit, quia fides non habet meritum, cui humana ratio probet experimentum... Panis ad corpus refert, vinum ad animam, quia vinum sanguinem operatur, in quo sedes animæ... "Fregit," non antequam verba consecrationis perferret sed post. [Singular this charge of anachronism against the Evangelist as in Cajetan and other good Romish writers.] Unde cum

when the evangelist said 'He brake,' He says it by anticipation, because Christ consecrated it, as we do. For the priest does not put forth the words of consecration in His own person, but in the person of Christ... 'He took bread and blessed it.' But of this blessing He did not make mention to the apostles (!) because Matthew understood by it nothing more than an explanation of those words, *i.e.* 'This is My body.' We must not understand that He brake His own body, for it is not in the sacrament in a frangible mode: but He brake the forms of the bread that were still remaining... 'This is My body,' *i.e.* contained under these forms (species). The bread is the true body which came from Mary, which is made to be by Divine virtue through the conversion of the bread's substance into Christ's true body... We must consider that he accomplishes this sacred (mystery) in the consecrating of the material, and not in the use merely of the material itself. But the other sacraments are made not in the consecrating of the material but in the use of it: as baptism and confirmation are not accomplished in the blessing of the water and of the chrism (oil) (before it is used) but in the act of washing and anointing, together with set forms of words. 'In like manner also the cup,' &c. Because this cup is My blood, in the shedding of which He confirms the new testament, because a testament (will) is confirmed when men are dead; or it is the new promise, not of a typical but of an eternal benefit."

---

dixit "Fregit," anticipando dicit, quia consecravit ut nos: nam sacerdos non profert verba consecrationis in personâ propriâ, sed in personâ Christi... "Accepit panem et benedixit." De qua benedictione apostolis mentionem non fecit [This is a mistake. See Matt. and Mk.], quia Matthæus per illam nihil aliud intellexit quam explicationem verborum, sc. "Hoc est corpus Meum"... Non est intelligendum quod corpus Suum fregit, quod non est in sacramento fragibili modo, sed fregit species panis remanentes... "Hoc est corpus Meum," *i.e.* contentum sub his speciebus. Panis est verum corpus Mariæ, quod fit virtute Divinâ per conversionem substantiæ panis in verum corpus Christi. Considerandum est quod hoc sacrum perficit in consecratione materiæ non in usu ipsius. Alia vero sacramenta non proficiunt in consecratione materiæ sed in usu; sicut baptismus et confirmatio non proficiunt in benedictione aquæ et chrismatis, sed in ablutione et unctione cum determinatis verborum formis "Similiter et calicem, &c." Quia hic calix est Meus sanguis, in quo effuso confirmat novum testamentum: quod testamentum in mortuis confirmatur; vel est nova promissio, non typalis sed eterni boni.

(B.) WILLIAM OF OCKHAM, FELLOW OF MERTON IN OXFORD.  
EARLY IN CENT. XIV.

He was the restorer of Nominalism in the fourteenth century : who earned the title of Doctor singularis. He was born at the village of that name in Surrey, the patronage of whose church vests now in the Earl of Lovelace. He was a follower of Duns Scotus, and joined the Dominicans, but he is called a cordelier of St Francis, and the book quoted says he was a Minorite ; ordinis fratrum minorum. His great work is reckoned to be his Dialogus, in which, like Marsilius of Padua and some others, he just then raises the question that sovereigns are not subordinate to the pope. But his name is deeply involved in a ridiculous discussion, in the course of which he was imprisoned, "whether either Christ or his "little society of apostles held any kind of worldly properties;" a discussion only notable for its producing Ockham's speech to Louis of Bavaria in favour of Nicolas and in opposition to Pope John XXII., "Sire, defend us from the Antipope James of Cahors with "your sword, and we shall well know how to defend you against "him with our pen." (Montigny, cited Dict. Historique, article Occam). Ockham received also the title of Venerabilis inceptor from having founded a new school of Nominalism, which Durandus (de St Porcien) had failed to do. He is therefore the object of unmeasured contempt in the Dictionary just quoted, because the realistic view of universals suited better with Roman views on this subject of the Lord's supper. They tried to prove him unsound upon it, though he laboured to be orthodox : and perhaps he might have been thought so, but what part could Romanists hold with a man who said that the general idea "the church" had nothing more than a Nominalist existence ? He was however quite candid ; for he very naturally made the same affirmation regarding his favourite rival power "the state." Yet he seems explicit enough in his high notions on the Lord's supper to satisfy even Rome. His treatise on Logic was published at Oxford, 1675.

A *Treatise of the venerable inceptor William Ockham on the sacrament of the altar. Sold in the Rue Royal at St Jacques',*

---

*Tractatus venerabilis inceptoris Gulielmi Ockam, de sacramento altaris. Venumdant in viâ regiâ ad divum St Jacobum : sub coronato lilio.*

*under the lily and crown in the shop of Mr N. de Barre ...  
Praise to God and to His mother Mary.*

C. I. "About the conversion of the bread into Christ's body, as a certain gloss, &c. II. In the matter of the sacraments there are different opinions on the Divine Consecration. One asserts that that substance, which at first was the substance of bread, is afterwards the flesh and blood of Christ in the breaking of the bread, is...the body on the altar. A second opinion holds that the substance of bread and wine ceases to be there, and that the accidents alone remain, that is to say taste, colour and the like: and that under those accidents it begins to be the body... A third holds that the substance of bread and wine remains there (also), and that in the same spot and under the same (outward) appearance is Christ's body (too)... Any of these opinions however confesses that Christ's body is there. The second opinion is the more true. From the treatise (tract) on the Supreme Trinity, chap. 'firmly,' p. 1. These are the words of the gloss. And from this it appears that the substance of the bread is converted into Christ's body; so that the substance of the bread remains not. And for that truth this is said, from the treatise, &c. &c. There is one universal church of the faithful, outside whom (which) none at all is saved; and in this He is Himself Priest and Sacrifice in one: Jesus... Whose body and blood is truly contained in the sacrament of the altar under the species [kinds, forms, appearances] of bread and wine, the bread being transubstantiated into the body and the wine into the blood by the power of God. To declare that truth some things

*In ædibus M. N. de Barra. (On final page a picture of Saint Roch). Paris, 1563. Laus Deo et genetrici Ejus Mariæ.*

C. I. Circa conversionem panis in corpus Christi, sicut dicit glossa quædam II. de conse. Div. In sacramentorum (re) variæ sunt opiniones. Una asserit quod illa substantia quæ fuit panis primo, postea est caro et sanguis Christi in fractione panis, est in altari, &c. q. corpus. Secunda opinio tenet quod substantia panis et vini ibi desinit esse, et maneat (maneant) accidentia tantum, scilicet sapor color et similia: et sub illis accidentibus incipit esse corpus Christi. Tertia tenet quod remanet ibi substantia panis et vini, et in eodem loco et sub eadem specie est corpus Christi ar. infr. e. ego. Quælibet tamen opinio fatetur ibi esse corpus Christi. Secunda opinio verior est. Ex tractatu de summâ Trinitate ca. firmiter, pa. una. Hæc sunt verba glossæ. Ex quâ apparet quod substantia panis convertitur in corpus Christi; ita quod substantia panis non manet. Et pro istâ veritate dicitur ex tract., &c. &c. Una est enim fidelium universalis ecclesia, extra quos nullus omnino salvatur. In quâ Ipse idem Sacerdos est et Sacrificium, Jesus Christus, Cujus corpus et sanguis in sacramento altaris sub speciebus panis et vini veraciter continetur, transubstantiatis pane in corpus et vino in sanguinem potestate Divinâ. Ad istius veritatis declarationem, circa

are to be enquired into; in the first place principally about two things, as it is plain, about the entity and calling of the accidents of them. Secondly about the severances of them from their subject (not subjectio). But because it is commonly conceded by all, that colour, taste, and sensible qualities of this kind are really distinguished among themselves (*i.e.* have a really distinct existence) and also from (their) substance, therefore on this hypothesis some things are to be enquired into regarding the distinction of those qualities from quantity, figure, straightness and things of this kind: and concerning these there is great doubt how they are to be distinguished: and that that enquiry does not so much belong to theology, but to philosophy also, since it is the work of philosophy to know the natures and distinctions of those things. Therefore we must investigate what was thought by philosophers and chiefly Aristotle the chief of philosophers on that matter, and also what is said by theologians. But that I may proceed the more in order, I will first enquire of the distinction of a point, a line, a surface and a body, and afterwards of the other things. First then I enquire, whether a point is an absolute thing, really distinguished from quantity, &c. &c. It is not a thing positive, and absolute, and really distinguished from a quantity, and especially from a line, &c." Secondly, he gives authorities for believing it *res alia* another thing: and then he answers them, &c. &c.; and to the end of the treatise on the aforesaid points; the last chapter being on the solution of some arguments against the notion that different quantities can subjectively be in a substance, though two bodies cannot by nature be together (*i.e.* in the same spot or locality). [This is given as a specimen of the enquiry.]

---

duo principaliter, aliqua sunt quærenda, ut patet, circa illorum accidentium entitatem et dictionem. Secundo circa ipsorum a subjecto separationes. Quia autem communiter conceditur ab omnibus, quod color sapor et hujusmodi qualitates sensibiles inter se realiter distinguuntur, et etiam a substantia, ideo hoc supposito quærenda aliqua circa distinctionem istarum qualitatum, a quantitate figura rectitudine et hujusmodi; de quibus est magnus dubius quomodo distinguantur: et quod non tam ad theologiam sed etiam ad philosophiam pertinet ista consideratio, cum philosophia sit rerum naturas et distinctiones earum cognoscere. Ideo investigandum quid senserunt philosophi et præcipue princeps philosophorum Aristoteles de istâ materiâ et etiam quid dicant theologi. Ut autem ordinatius procedam, quæram primo de distinctione puncti lineæ superficiæ et corporis et postea (de) aliis. Primo igitur quæro, Utrum punctus sit res absoluta, distincta realiter a quantitate, &c. This he decides in the negative, *i.e.* that it is not aliqua res positiva et absoluta, distincta realiter a quâlibet quantitate et maxime a lineâ.

## (C.) JOHN TAULER, PREACHER AND MYSTIC. B. 1290.

Born of a wealthy family in Strasburg he by choice entered the Dominican order at about 18 years of age. It is interesting to us that one of the first emergent traits of his character was to cry out boldly against those that turned over multitudes of bulky volumes, and left the singularly instructive life of our Lord unregarded. Such was his feeling regarding what he saw at Paris, the centre for many ages of theological and philosophical lore. At 32 he is found the chief follower of Eckhard, and a great preacher of the genuine religious experience of that school. In fact he so surpassed his master and escaped his outrageous pantheism, that he deserves to be ranked equal with Fenelon and Bossuet; and there is no dispute that in the simple genuineness of unworldly piety he far surpasses one of them. The history of his praying for eight years for some one to be sent to teach him pure and full truth, and of his seeming to hear a voice which bade him go to the cathedral gate, and which said that he would there find the man that he sought; and his finding a ragged beggar who taught him the striking doctrines of the Quietists; then another person thrice dreaming that he ought to go to Tauler to learn how to become perfect in piety; but his becoming the teacher of Tauler and remaining with him a long while and at last being martyred at Vienna for holding that Christ was in him and that he was in Christ, "Ye in Me and I in you!" and his name is Nicolas of Basle. These stories I say have few things to surpass them in the pages of holy fiction; and yet we suppose them true. Susanna Winkworth has put the second story within the reach of English readers: but as the sermons which she selects for translation in the same volume are only such as are said to be "of a practical order," she deprives her readers of all knowledge of such "speculative" subjects as Tauler's opinions on the Lord's supper. Not daring to attempt to translate German I use the French rendering of "the sermons for the year" by M. Charles Sainte-Foi, which claims to be a better translation than the old Latin of Surius from which the first story comes. Tauler witnessed in Strasburg the miseries of the interdict laid on by John XXII. *Delirant reges plectuntur Achivi.* For 14 years were men deprived of the Lord's supper. Henry



of Nordlingen, an object of special persécution, was one of Tauler's peculiar friends. At Basle Tauler most gladly associated with Henry Suso, and with many others, who merit the noble title of Reformers of the 14th century. It is not wonderful that some have attributed "The Imitation of Christ" to Tauler: but see the sketch of Thomas à Kempis. Tauler like him obtains the praise of the Churches of all lands in which he is dispersed and studied. He was not a Protestant: but he was a sincere Christian.

*Sermons of John Tauler, the enlightened doctor, translated from the German, by M. Charles Sainte-Foi for Sundays and Festivals of the year. Serm. I. for the feast of the body of Christ.*

P. 96. "He whose heart is empty, vain and negligent, who continues to lead a light life, surrendering himself to the uttering of indiscreet words, to the cultivation of exquisitism in his habits of life, to amusements and to idleness, who neglects the care of his soul and who in this state perseveringly, knowingly and of his own will approaches in spite of all this to the sacrament of the altar, does a very dangerous thing. It were a hundred thousand times better for him to keep himself far away. You will have confessed in vain if you do not choose to leave behind you the opportunities for sinning. The pope himself would not know how to absolve you without your repenting.

P. 111. "For the first two degrees of perfection there is nothing more advantageous in order to make true progress and carry on a Divine life than these two things (the communion and the word of God), for these are far above all other. But

*Sermons de Jean Tauler le docteur illuminé, traduits de l'Allemand en deux tomes par M. C. Sainte-Foi pour les Dimanches et Fêtes de l'année, Tom. II. Paris, 1855. P. 96. Sermon I.*

Celui dont le cœur est vide vain et négligent, qui continue d'être léger dans sa vie, adonné à l'indiscrétion dans les paroles, à la recherche dans les habits, aux amusements, à l'oisiveté, qui néglige le soin de son âme et qui persévérant sciemment et volontairement dans cet état, approche, malgré cela, du sacrement de l'autel, fait une chose bien dangereuse. Il faudrait cent mille fois mieux pour lui qu'il s'éloignât. Vous aurez beau vous confesser si vous ne voulez pas laisser là les occasions du péché, le pape lui-même ne saurait vous absoudre sans repentir. [Compare Antoine Arnauld against the book of the Jesuit "La fréquente communion."]

P. 111. *Sermon II.*

Aux deux premiers degrés de la perfection il n'est rien de plus avantageux pour faire de vrai progrès dans le bien et pour mener une vie divine, que ces deux choses (la communion et la parole de Dieu), qui

for him that has arrived at the third degree all help and all consolation is sometimes an obstacle.

P. 113. "The grace that we receive in the eucharist is the end and the reward of all the rest, since we there receive God Himself with nothing to intervene, in reality and simply. Also the eucharist is a grace by itself and super-essential, and it surpasses all the rest.

P. 114. John vi., "My flesh," &c. "Those that see in the sacrament of the altar only a beverage and a food, i.e. of bread and wine, cannot know or taste the precious fruits and the ineffable sweetness which it contains. The nourishment for our bodies is in itself a thing so vile and dead that man in assimilating it ennobles and vivifies it; but this Divine nourishment is full of life, or rather it is the very essence of life; and those that eat it live eternally. 'He that eateth,' &c. These words were not understood by many of His friends, who, after having heard them, left Him, saying 'Who can hear it?' They had taken only the carnal sense; and it was for this that they quitted our Lord; for this food is much above all the senses. Here the thing that nourishes us, and the nourishment that He gives, is all one.

P. 117. "Also the eucharist's food causes our souls to pass

sont bien au-dessus de toutes les autres. Mais pour celui qui est arrivé au troisième degré tout secours et toute consolation est quelquefois un obstacle. [See also his *De Vita et Passione* S. N. J. C. Cologne.]

P. 113. *Sermon III.*

La grâce que nous recevons dans l'eucharistie est le terme et la récompense de toutes les autres, puisque nous y recevons Dieu lui-même immédiatement réellement et simplement : aussi l'eucharistie est-elle une grâce singulière et sursentielle (wrong rendering of *ἐνωσιον* in the Lord's prayer), qui surpasse toutes les autres.

P. 114. *On John VI. "My flesh is truly meat," &c.*

Ceux qui ne voient dans le sacrement de l'autel qu'un breuvage et un aliment du pain et du vin, ne peuvent ni connaître ni goûter les fruits précieux et l'ineffable suavité qu'il renferme. La nourriture corporelle est en soi-même quelque chose de vil et de mort, que l'homme ennoblit et vivifie en se l'assimilant; mais cette nourriture divine est pleine de vie, ou plutôt elle est l'essence même de la vie; et ceux qui la mangent vivent éternellement. "He that eateth my flesh, &c." Ces paroles ne furent pas comprises de plusieurs de Ses amis, qui, après les avoir entendues, le quittèrent en disant, "Who can hear it?" Ils n'avaient pris que le sens charnel; et c'est pour cela qu'ils quittèrent notre Seigneur : car cet aliment est bien au-dessus de tous les sens. Ici Celui qui nourrit, et la nourriture qu'Il donne, est tout un.

P. 117.

After the common comparison of the mingling of fire with wood, Ainsi l'aliment eucharistique fait passer notre âme de la différence à la

from differing from Christ to resembling Him, and from resemblance to a Divine unity with Him. See what happens to the glorified spirit that in this mysterious union is neither like nor unlike to God. For in this ardent furnace of love Divine, it loses all that it has in itself of humidity, of inequality and grossness, and with this sacred food casts itself into the abyss of Divine love.

P. 121. "All that sincerely desire to reach perfection ought so to live that they may be able often to receive this living nourishment. They that find themselves established in love, &c. do well to approach as often as they can to the holy table.

P. 122. "What more sure way of correcting the imperfections of my grossness, of renewing, regenerating and rebaptizing in me the old man with its nature, its manners and its customs, than the reception of the true Son of God; His true living and Divine body: His adorable blood, that washes and purifies all stains, His holy soul, His holy spirit, His tender heart, His eternal Deity, His dear humanity, the holy Trinity all entire, in one word all that He is, all that He has, and all that He can do (for us)... I have said all these things to you with the aid of God's grace; but what remains to be said to you is what I have taken from the best of the holy doctors, &c.

ressemblance avec Lui, et de la ressemblance à l'Unité Divine. Voilà ce qui arrive à l'esprit glorifié, qui dans cette union mystérieuse n'est ni semblable ni dissemblable à Dieu: car dans cette fournaise ardente de l'amour Divin, il perd tout ce qu'il a en lui d'humide d'inégal et de grossier, et s'abîme avec cet aliment sacré dans la Divinité même.

P. 121.

Tous ceux qui désirent sincèrement arriver à la perfection devraient se conduire de telle sorte qu'ils puissent recevoir souvent cette nourriture vivante. Ceux qui se trouvent affermis dans la charité, &c., &c., font bien d'approcher le plus souvent qu'ils peuvent de la table Sainte.

P. 122.

Quel moyen plus sûr pour moi de corriger mes imperfections grossières, de renouveler régénérer et rebaptiser en moi le vieil homme avec sa nature ses mœurs et ses habitudes qu'en recevant le vrai Fils de Dieu, Son vrai corps vivant et Divin, Son sang adorable qui lave et purifie toutes les souillures, Sa sainte âme, Son saint Esprit, Son tendre cœur, Son éternelle Divinité, Sa chère humanité, la sainte Trinité toute entière, en un mot tout ce qu'Il est, tout ce qu'Il a et tout ce qu'Il peut... Je vous ai dit toutes ces choses avec la grâce de Dieu: mais ce qui me reste à vous dire est ce que j'ai appris de meilleur des saints docteurs, &c., &c.

P. 137. "I have read somewhere of the soul of a dead man appearing to a friend of God, in a flame whose ardent heat was intolerable. It said to him that the cause of its punishments was having been negligent in receiving the holy eucharist, and that for this reason it suffered tortures that none could believe or explain. It afterwards said to him, If you would receive the communion with fervour for me once you would greatly comfort me. This friend of God did so and the spirit appeared to him afresh on the morrow, in a state of greater brilliance than the sun. A single communion had been sufficient to deliver it from all its sufferings and to open to it the gates of eternal life."

---

P. 137.

J'ai lu quelque part que l'âme d'un défunt apparut un jour à un ami de Dieu, dans une flamme dont les ardeurs paraissent intolérables. Elle lui dit que la cause de ses supplices, c'était d'avoir été négligente dans la réception de la sainte eucharistie ; et qu'elle souffrait à cause de cela des tourments que personne ne pourrait croire ni expliquer. Elle lui dit ensuite, Si tu voulais communier une seule fois pour moi avec ferveur, tu me soulagerais grandement. Cet ami de Dieu l'ayant fait, l'esprit lui apparut de nouveau le lendemain dans un état plus brillant que celui du soleil. Une seule communion avait suffi pour le délivrer de toutes ses souffrances et pour lui ouvrir les portes de la vie éternelle. A devout wish closes this sermon on the Festival Corpus Christi.

(D.) NICEPHORUS XANTHOPULUS. THE CHURCH'S THUCYDIDES.  
1386.

P. 1136. "Novatus, in making the offerings, as is the custom for priests to make them, then when he turned to the distribution of the bread, imparting to each his portion, used to compel the wretched men to take an oath (first) instead of (at once) receiving the eucharist. For holding both the hands of the recipient he did not (Gk. does not) let them go until they had sworn to these things: for I will use his own words: Swear to me by the blood and the body of our Lord Jesus Christ never to desert me and to return to Cornelius.

---

*Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopulus, Hist. Eccles. T. VI., p. 1136.  
Migne, 145—147.*

Ποιῶν γὰρ προσφορὰς, ὡς ἔθος ἱερεῦσι ποιεῖν, εἶτα πρὸς τὴν τοῦ ἄρτου μεταδόσιν τρεπόμενος, ἐπιδίδους ἐκάστῳ τὸ μέρος, ὀμνύειν τοὺς ταλαιπώρους (Ναύατος) ἠνάγκαζεν ἀντὶ τοῦ μετ' εὐχαριστίας λαμβάνειν. Κατέχων γὰρ ἀμφω τὰς χεῖρας τοῦ λαβόντος οὐ πρότερον ἀνίει ἕως ταῦτα ὁμόσαιεν. χρῆσθαι γὰρ αὐτοῦ τοῖς ῥήμασιν, "Ὁμοσόν μοι κατὰ τοῦ αἵματος καὶ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μηδέποτε με καταλιπεῖν καὶ ἐπιστρέψαι πρὸς Κορνήλιον.

*A relation by Dionysius of an old man Serapion lying at the borders of death and receiving the communion from a little boy, when the presbyter could not come.*

C. VI. "But the injunction being by me laid down, that those who were leaving this life, if they should request it, and especially if they happened to have received it before also, on their own entreaty, should receive remission, that they may leave this life in good hope. (The presbyter) gave a little piece of the eucharist to the boy, and ordered him to wet it well and to make a drop fall and go down in the old man's mouth. The boy came up with it; and being near, Serapion again called to him before he entered and said, 'Art thou come, my son? and so the presbyter could not 'come. Well: do you do quickly as you were ordered and 'release me.' The boy wetted it well and at the same time poured it into his mouth, and the man swallowed a little and immediately gave up the ghost. Surely was he not evidently preserved to the end, and abode with us till he was released, and his sin (sins) were blotted out, and he was able to be acknowledged for the many good things he had done? [Sad doctrine!]

C. VI. Ἐντολὴς ὑπ' ἐμοῦ δεδομένης τοὺς ἀπαλλαττομένους τοῦ βίου, εἰ δέοντο καὶ μάλιστα εἰ καὶ πρότερον ἱκετεύσαντες τύχοιεν, ἀφίσσθαι, ἵνα εὐέλπιδες ἀπαλλάττωνται. Βραχὺ τῆς εὐχαριστίας ἔδωκε τῷ παιδαρίῳ, ἀποβρέξαι κελεύσας καὶ τῷ πρεσβύτῃ κατὰ τοῦ στόματος ἐπιστάξαι. Ἐπανῆκεν ὁ παῖς φέρων· ἐγγὺς δὲ γενομένου, πρὶν εἰσελθεῖν, ἀνανέγκας πάλιν ὁ Σεραπίων, Ἦκες, ἔφη, τέκνον; καὶ ὁ μὲν πρεσβύτερος ἔλθειν οὐκ ἠδυνήθη. Σὺ δὲ ποίησον ταχέως τὸ προσταχθέν καὶ ἀπάλλαττέ με. Ἀπέβρεξεν ὁ παῖς, καὶ ἅμα τε ἐνέχεε τῷ στόματι, καὶ μικρὸν ἐκείνος καταβρογθίσας, εὐθὺς ἔδωκε τὸ πνεῦμα. Ἀρ' οὐκ ἐναργῶς διετηρήθη καὶ παρέμεινεν ἕως λυθῆ, καὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἐξαλειφθείσης ἐπὶ πολλοῖς οἷς ἔπραξε καλοῖς ὁμολογηθῆναι ἠδυνήθη;

*Lib. XIII. 10.*

A touching account of Chrysostom's expulsion from Constantinople, with ἀμύνητος (used for a non-communicant).

(E.) JOHN DE WYCLIFFE, D.D., R. OF LUTTERWORTH, and of Queen's and Merton, Oxford. B. 1324. D. 1387.

This well-known life is one of the glories of England—one of many instances of firm and quiet persistence in a conscientious course: nor is it a slight encouragement to those who follow in his steps that his writings issued from his island home to become the text-book of the twin champions of truth at Constance. Who then can tell us where heavenly light, once enkindled afresh, will stop? For if the two murders at the Council of Constance

destroyed the only chance of the recovery of universal papal power after its humiliations at Avignon, the great Lutterworth teacher of those martyrs may be credited with much of the results of their firm faith. The *Dialogus* is given from Dr R. Vaughan's English, as he has not printed the Latin. It is a conversation between Phronesis (judgment), Aletheia (truth), and Pseudos (falsehood). Wycliff's confession in London and all that follows it are extracted from three volumes recently published. Much exaggeration seems to have attended his incautious opinions on the right of dominion being dependent on grace. The charge lay heavy on the accused at Constance. Half truths are half errors.

*Wycliff's confession at the Court of London.* "Remains" published at Oxford, 1869, Vol. III. p. 502.

"Johannes Wycliff—I believe, as Christ and His Apostles have taught us, that the sacrament of the altar—whole bread—and like to other bread—or host sacred—is very God's body in form of bread. And though it be broken in three parts (as the Kirk uses), or else in a thousand, every ilk one of these parts is the same God's body. And right as the person of Christ is very God and man—very Godhead and very manhood, right so holy Kirk many hundred winters has trowed the same sacrament is very God's body and very bread, as it is form of God's body and form of bread, as teach Christ and His apostles. And therefore St Paul names it never but when he calls it bread; and he by our belief took in this his wit (knowledge) of God. And the arguments of heretics against this sentence are light for to assoyle to a Christian man. And right as it is heresy to trowe that Christ is a spirit and no body, so it is heresy to trowe that this sacrament is God's body and no bread: for it is both together.

*Tracts and Treatises of Wycliff by the Wycliff Soc. London, 1845. Dialogus, Book IV. p. 132.*

"This sensible thing (called the consecrated bread) is called a sacrament and not a thing (not in the sense of its not being anything, since as we see it is obvious enough to the senses) but in the sense of its *not* being 'that holy thing,' primarily signified by the sensible sign which we see, because it is *not*, naturally, the body of Christ. [P. 133.] This sacrament is the body of Christ in the form of bread... Can any one thing I ask be more contrary to another than the doctrine which affirms this sacrament to be *sacramentally* the body of Christ, and the self-contradictory doctrine maintaining that this sacrament cannot be, *in any sense*, the body of Christ? [P. 138.] Inasmuch as this bread is the

body of Christ, it is therefore bread and remains bread, and is at once bread and the body of Christ... [P. 139.] Do we believe that John the Baptist who was made Elias (figuratively) by the word of Christ ceased to be John (Matt. xi.)?... And in the same manner it is merely a double meaning not a contradiction, in those who admit that this sacrament is not naturally the body of Christ, but that this same sacrament is Christ's body figuratively. [P. 140.] Oh if believers in the Lord will look on and see Antichrist and his accomplices so strong as to have power to condemn and persecute unto death those sons of the church who thus yield their belief unto the gospel, yet certain I am that though the truth of the gospel may for a time be cast down into the streets and be kept under in a measure by the threats of Antichrist, yet extinguished it cannot be, since He, Who is the Truth, hath said that heaven and earth shall pass away, but His words shall not pass away. Let the believer then rouse himself and demand strictly from our heretics what the nature of this venerable sacrament is, if it be not bread, since the language of the gospel, the evidence of our senses, and arguments that have in their favour every probability say that so it is... Our fore-mentioned conclusion that this venerable sacrament is, in its own nature, veritable bread and sacramentally Christ's body, is shewn to be the true one. [P. 142.] Hardness, softness, &c. cannot exist per se; nor can they be *the subjects of other accidents*: it remains therefore that there must be some subject as bread... [P. 148.] The body of Christ, *i. e.* sacramentally the sign and figure of the body itself. But *the most heresy* that God suffered to come to His church is *to trowe* that this sacrament is *accident without subject*, and may no wise be God's body. And if thou say (it), by (with) her skill holy Kirk has been in error many hundred winters; for Christ says, by witness of Jerome (in the Vulgate Latin), that this bread is His body. Sooth it is specially since the fiend was loosed, that was (*i. e.* to be), by witness of the angel to St John the Evangelist, after a thousand winters (since) that Christ was styed (ascended [sty is a ladder]) to Heaven. But it is to suppose that many saints that died in the meantime before their death were purged of this error. O how great diversity is between us that trow that this sacrament is very bread in its kind and between heretics that tell that it is an accident without subject. For before that the fiend, father of lies, was loosed, was never this gabbing contrived. And how great diversities between us that trow that this sacrament, in its kind, is very bread and, sacramentally, God's body, and between hereticks that trow and tell that this sacrament may in no wise be God's body. For I dare surely say that if this were sooth, Christ and His saints died hereticks and the more part of holy Kirk believe now heresy; and therefore devout men suppose that this council of heresy at

London was with earthdin (earthquake) for (because) they put a heresy on Christ and saints in Heaven; wherefore the earth trembled, failing man's answering for God. So it did in the time of His passion when He was damned to bodily death. Christ and his mother, that inground have destroyed all heresies, keep His Kirk in the right belief of this sacrament: and move we the king and his realm to ask sharply of clerks this office, that all pensioners on pain of loosing all their temporalities tell the king and His realm with sufficient grounds what is the sacrament: and all the orders of friars on pain of losing all their allegiance tell the king and his realm with sufficient grounds what is this sacrament. For I am certain if the third part of the clergy, that defends this sentence that is here said, that *they* will defend it on pain of losing of their life. Amen."

It is perhaps hardly fair of Wycliff, living in the heyday of transubstantiation and all its consequent evils, to charge these successors of Innocent III. and his council with holding the existence of accidents only in the bread and wine *without a subject*: since they stoutly maintained that the subject or substance of Christ's natural body was by the Spirit substituted for the substance or subject of bread. In one place indeed Wycliff asserts according to true philosophy that no change of subject ever takes place between any two created things: and so he hits the Papists of that day midway *after* the accidents of the bread have lost its subject and *before* they obtained the substance of the Lord's body. This is sharp practice. But again, he blames them for denying that the bread is our Lord's body, because they will not allow that the bread is Christ's body in the only way in which he (Wycliff) will admit that it can be, *i. e.* sacramentally or figuratively. Candour is not more common in this controversy than in controversies in general.

(F.) JOHN HUSS (JANOS HUS). B. 1373. D. 1415.

(G.) JEROME OF PRAGUE. B. 1378. D. 1416.

Whenever a leading man appears in a great movement it is almost always safe to assume that he had his pioneers whose names have not reached the general ear. It was eminently so with Luther. It was also with John Huss. Three of his precursors are Militz, an archdeacon, Conrad, an Austrian, and Janow, properly called Matthias; and it is curious that the point then insisted upon by the reformers was the restoration



of daily communion. The last in particular wished thus to reinstate the laity in full equality of reception of the supper with the clergy. But the treatise on the right of the laity to the cup is by Huss, and was written at Constance before he was committed to prison. Its title is characteristic of the unadvanced state of his own opinions. It would run thus in English:—"On the right of the laity to receive the blood of Christ under the species (Eng. form) of wine." It is singular that the great Gerson and D'Ailly both joined Huss's enemies. But so it often is in a perilous revolution. Each man is apt to isolate himself and to believe and fight for his own favoured point, and to think that the objects of others ought to be waived in order to carry that one which he pushes on. Their chief idea was to subject the Pope and Christendom to a supremacy lodged in general councils; and the movement survived the mistakes of their policy: but they spared very little attention for Huss's rights and struggles, and so actually suffered themselves to be enrolled against him. But though Huss's name is in all churches, perhaps few persons know that he lived and died a thorough believer in transubstantiation, just as did Savonarola; and just like Savonarola he had his heart full of all spiritual feeling towards Christ in person, while he fully believed that he was eating and drinking Christ's very body and blood. Why then did the Roman rulers burn him? First, he had attacked clerical corruption, and the Pope's rule. But so had many in every country. Secondly, he had received to the full the doctrine Wycliff so much favoured, that dominion is of grace; and in this he had defied both the pope and his own archbishop Zbynek. There was error in this undoubtedly. Thirdly, he had demanded the restoration of the cup to the laity. And fourthly, he had come out as a righteous Abel and a truth-preaching Noah, and a heavenly-minded Enoch, to those sons of Cain. But Milman makes an acute remark that Pope John XXIII., who most unwillingly conceded and attended this council, felt himself caught in a trap when he entered the city: and that, when the safe-conduct of John Huss was violated, the Pope felt his own security gone: and therefore took the earliest opportunity of escaping from the city. Perhaps the most fit remark, to close, is that our gallant countryman John Wycliff little thought that his witness would work to regenerate a German kingdom:

but Huss really *was*, above all other things, a foreign follower of the great Rector of Lutterworth. And this is all owing reasonably to the marriage of our Richard II. to Ann, daughter of the Bohemian king Wenceslaus.

Jerome, a knight of Bohemia, was not the only chevalier of that land who aspired after literary and scientific as well as religious truth, and he was a considerable traveller. He had visited Oxford, probably on Wycliff's account. His youth, his eloquence, his simple piety availed nothing. He was entrapped and recanted, recanted his recantation, and was mercilessly slain. Huss before he died dreamed that Jerome was taken to prison.

As to the position of Huss, properly pronounced Husch, he was a native of Husinec, an obscure town in the circle of Prachin in Bohemia: but his talents raised him to be Rector of the University of Prague, and confessor of the Queen of Bohemia, the second wife of King Wenceslaus. He was also preacher in the chapel of Bethlehem, founded at Prague for preaching in the Bohemian tongue. Some Vaudois had prepared the way in Prague when works of Wycliff arrived there in 1385. In 1453, forty-five Wycliffite propositions were discussed and condemned by the University. Yet at the council of Pisa, Zbynek, the archbishop of Bohemia, reported that he had not one heretic in his province. Wycliff's *Dialogus* was widely dispersed by Huss among the principal Bohemian laymen, and he ventured to praise Wycliff in his sermons. In 1410, five hundred suspected volumes were publicly burned, and Huss was known to be in danger. Thus things went. Zbynek died, and the pope delayed sending the pall to his successor: but sent a bull commanding a crusade against Ladislas, king of Naples: and this bull was preached against by Huss, and contumeliously treated and publicly burned by a Hussite knight. In 1412, Huss was put under the greater excommunication, and Prague under an interdict, excepting only the palace of the king. The rest of the story is well known. The Emperor Sigismund's safe-conduct was broken, the reformer was imprisoned, and things worked on to the bitter end, as by his foes was intended from the beginning.

It is handed down that this Jerome at his burning summoned his persecutors to appear a hundred years from that day at the bar of God, and to give an account of his innocent blood. We need only remark that he gave them a longer period than the

common laws of life would allow. We see in his words no prophecy of the rise of Luther. Jerome makes the third with Berengar and Cranmer who first earned an unhappy notoriety in God's Church by recanting, and then obtained the lessened glory of recanting their own recantation. But the first of the true teachers at Cambridge and others of less conspicuous lustre paled their brightness thus, and then shone out again in like manner. Stars in the heavens which undergo combustion reappear, but are of lesser magnitude. Martyrs that have shrunk from death may suffer in their glory.

P. 47. "Treatise on the sacrament of Christ's body and blood published from the prison at Constance. I have subordinated my mind to Holy Writ, entirely desiring neither to think or assert anything contrary thereto, but in harmony with the blessed Augustine's rule, 'most firmly believing whatever Christ wills to be believed respecting Himself, and believing nothing which He does not will to be believed respecting Himself.' Believing also with holy mother the church every credible truth just as the blessed Trinity wills that it should be granted. Holding also the opinion (or sentence) of general councils and holy doctors of the church whether explicitly or implicitly declared. Holding fast this too with all my heart, that I should desire, by the hope and aid of the Lord now Christ (in Heaven), to suffer the penalty of a terrible death, before I would choose to assert anything contrary to the holy faith. For which reason under the same protestation I have taught, read and answered in certain books in the University of Prague and have preached to the people through the realm of Bohemia, and especially of Prague, the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Under the same believing

---

*J. Hussii Historia et Monumenta, p. 47. Nuremb. 1715.*

Tractatus de Sacramento Corp. et Sang. Christi e carcere Constantiæ editus. Ego mentem meam Scripturæ sacræ subjeci, nihil volens penitus vel sentire vel asserere illi contrarium, sed secundum regulam beati Augustini "Credens firmissime quicquid vult Christus de Se credi, et "nihil credens quod vult de Se non credi." Credens etiam cum sanctâ matre ecclesiâ omnem veritatem credibilem prout vult benedicta Trinitas ipsam concedi. Tenens etiam generalium conciliorum et sanctorum doctorum ecclesiæ sententiam explicite vel implicate. Retinens hoc etiam cordialiter, quod, antequam vellem aliquid sanctæ fidei contrarium asserere, quod vellem in spe et auxilio Domini jam Christi, pati supplicium diuæ mortis. Unde sub ipsâ protestatione quosdam semper libellos docui legi respondi in Univ. Pragensi et prædicavi populo per regnum Bohemiæ et specialiter Pragæ evangelium Jesu Christi. Sub

and humble protest, reserving the possibility of a better judgment, I will for thy sake touch these points, (1) Wherefore it was established, (2) What is to be believed, (3) What is to be received, and (4) In what kind it is to be received by Christ's faithful. (1) It is suggested that a faithful man ought to recal to memory, as far as he can, the life of our Lord Jesus Christ, especially His passion, His works and benefits... On which account the presbyters say in the office of the mass, 'We offer to thee this cup in 'remembrance of the saving passion, resurrection and ascension of 'Jesus Christ our Lord.' Three things are named there, which are principally signified by the oblation of the sacrament that is to be venerated... and (the priest) ought to have these elevations present in his memory while he raises and offers to God the Father in the sacrament the (ever) to be venerated body of Christ which He God Himself offered on the altar of the cross. Hence the blessed Augustine says that 'the offering of this sacrament is Christ's 'passion in the mystery which has been signified,' i. e. represents the mystery of the passion of our Lord Jesus Christ. And for a sign of this the priest that desires to perform mass puts on himself many vestments which mark the robes in which Jesus Himself in His own passion was mocked both by the Gentiles and by the Jews. Whence it is that he who devoutly calls to mind the passion of Christ itself, he spiritually eats His flesh and drinks His blood, even though he should not (have opportunity to) receive the venerated sacrament, &c. (2) When simple persons believe that there is in the venerated sacrament, from the power and institution of Christ, true God and true man,

---

eâdem protestatione fidei et humili salvo meliore iudicio tanquam pro tui gratiâ ista puncta, (1) Quare institutum, (2) Quid credendum, (3) Quod est sumendum, (4) Qualiter a Christi fidelibus sumendum. (1) Innuitur quod fidelis debet in memoriam recolligere, quantum potest, vitam Domini Jesu Christi, specialiter passionem Ejus...opera et beneficia... Unde in Missæ officio dicunt presbyteri, "Offerimus Tibi hunc "calicem salutaris in memoriam Passionis Resurrectionis et Ascensionis "Domini Jesu Christi." Tria ibi nominantur quæ principaliter per oblationem sacramenti venerabilis significantur. Et istas devotiones debet habere in memoriâ præsentibus dum elevat et offert in sacramento venerandum Deo Patri corpus Christi, quod Ipse Deus obtulit in arâ crucis... Hinc dicit beatus Aug. de Con. Dist. 2 quod "oblatio hujus "sacramenti est passio Christi in significato mysterio," i. e. representat mysterium passionis Domini Jesu Christi. Et in signum hujus sacerdos volens missare, multa vestimenta induit quæ signant vestimenta in quibus in passione Suâ et gentibus et a Judæis Ipse Jesus est illusus... Unde qui devote ipsam Christi passionem recolit, ille spiritualiter corpus Ejus manducat et sanguinem bibit, et si sacramentum venerabile non sumit, &c. (2) Cum credunt simplices quod ex potestate et institutione Christi, veri Dei et veri hominis, per ministerium sacerdotum est in sacra-

by the ministry of the priests, His own true body, which was conceived and born of Mary the virgin by the Holy Spirit's most pure power, which suffered on the cross, which lay in the sepulchre for three days, which ascended into Heaven and sits at the right hand of God, *that and not another*, without any new substantial inception of Himself is in this venerated sacrament itself. In a similar way the blood, &c. Also we must believe that as well a good as a bad priest having a right faith concerning the venerated sacrament, and having an intention to do it in such a manner as Christ enjoined, and accomplishes (makes) it saying the words in the mass according to the church's institution (*i. e.* by the virtue of the words he sacramentally, ministerially causes it to be under the appearance of bread the true body of Christ). In like manner under the appearance of wine, &c. And I say he does it ministerially, because he does it as a minister of Christ, who does it by the power and words of Christ, which Christ does by His own power, and by His own words, *transubstantiating the bread into His own body*, and the wine into His own blood. From which the church sings, 'Let the dogma be given 'to the Christians That bread passes into flesh and wine into 'blood,' and again, 'The Word flesh makes true bread flesh by 'the word [This is My body], And wine becomes the blood of 'Christ, And if sense fails (to grasp it) Then to confirm the sincere heart, Faith alone suffices.' And Augustine says, 'The 'sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord is neither more 'accomplished (made) by a good priest nor less by a bad.' I held the opinion of such before I became a priest, and from

---

mento venerabili, *verum corpus Suum*, quod conceptum est et natum ex Mariâ virgine castissimâ potestate sancti Spiritûs, quod passum est in cruce, quod jacuit in sepulchro pro triduo, quod ascendit in cœlum, et sedet ad dextram Dei Patris—*illud et non aliud* sine novâ Sui substantiali inceptione est in ipso sacramento venerabili. Similiter sanguis, &c. Item credendum est quod tam bonus quam malus sacerdos habens fidem rectam circa sacramentum venerabile, et habens intentionem sic facere ut præcepit Christus, et dicens verba in missâ secundum institutum ecclesiæ *conficit* (*i. e.* virtute verborum sacramentaliter facit ministerialiter esse sub specie panis verum corpus Christi). Similiter sub specie vini, &c. Et dico facit ministerialiter quia tanquam minister Christi, qui potestate et verbis Christi facit, quod facit Christus potestate propriâ et verbis propriis, *transubstantians panem in corpus Suum*, et vinum in sanguinem Suum. Unde canit ecclesia, "Dogma detur Christianis "Quod in carnem transit panis, Et vinum in sanguinem": et iterum, "Verbum caro panem verum Verbo carnem efficit, Fitque sanguis "Christi merum. Et si sensus deficit Ad firmandum cor sincerum, Sola "fides sufficit." Dicente Aug., "Sacramentum corporis et sanguinis "Domini nec a bono magis nec a malo minus perficitur." Istorum sententiam ante sacerdotium meum tenui et a principio sacerdotii mei

the beginning of my priesthood I have preached and written thus, as appears from my little book with my sermon on the body of Christ, which I wrote in the first year of my preaching, which was, as I reckon, the year of the Lord 1401. And afterwards I taught them in the University of Prague, reading (lecturing on) the book of the Master of the Sentences, I reckon A.D. 1409 [Jerome's authority led Peter Lombard to use the words *conficiunt corpus Christi*. Lombard's doing this causes Huss to use them. So error is handed down], in which year our lord Alexander was chosen in the council of Pisa to be pope. May God therefore spare all my enemies who have said and brought accusation against me before the Roman Curia, that I have ever preached that a priest living in mortal sin does not *make* (Christ's body), and cannot consecrate, &c. 'We must note,' as says St Bernard, 'there are three things: the truth of the flesh (of Christ); the unity of love; and the appearance of bread.' A bad man attains to (Christ's) true flesh: a righteous man to the union of love; a little mouse to the appearance (kind or form) of bread. (2) The Word flesh (the Son existing as man) causes by His word (by transubstantiation) true bread flesh, and wine becomes (by transubstantiation) blood. The matter of this is evident from Augustine's *Con. Dist. 2*, and through Ambrose, Eusebius and others; thence the canticle above mentioned, approved by Eusebius, was sung by me from the year when I began to learn to sing, and I sang it in the schools and in the church. I afterwards read both in my office and in the masses, and I preached in sermons and never preached that in the sacrament of either (bread or wine) there remains the natural bread of the sacrament, concerning which the enemies

---

*prædicavi et scripsi prout patet ex libello in sermone de corpore Christi quem scripsi primo anno meæ predicationis, qui fuit ut æstimo annus Domini 1401. [See Tractatus, p. 202.] Et post docui in Univ. Pragensi legendo librum Magistri Sententiarum, æstimo A.D. 1409, quo dominus Alexander in concilio Pisano electus fuit in Papatum. Parcat ergo Deus omnibus inimicis meis, qui dixerunt et ad Romanam Curiam accusationem detulerunt, me unquam prædicasse quod sacerdos existens in peccato mortali non conficit et non consecrat, &c.... "Notandum," ut ait Bernardus, "Sunt tria: veritas carnis, unio charitatis, et species panis." Ad veritatem carnis pertingit homo malus: ad unionem charitatis homo justus, ad speciem panis sorex parvus. (47) Verbum caro (i. e. Filius existens homo) efficit verbo per transubstantiationem verum panem carnem, et merum (i. e. vinum) fit (scilicet per transubstantiationem) sanguis. Patet iste materia de *Con. Dist. 2* (Aug.), per sanctos Amb. Euseb. et per alios; unde canticum supradictum approbatum ab Eusebio, ab anno quo cœpi cantare discere cantavique in scholis et in ecclesiâ. Post legi et in officio et in Missis et prædicavi in sermonibus et nunquam prædicavi quod in sacramento alterius manet sacramenti panis naturalis, de*

of the truth lyingly have accused me. There is further the point that in this venerated sacrament one thing is perceived by the senses and another thing is believed to be there. That is the blessed Augustine's idea. 'For the appearance (form) of the 'sacred sign is perceived, and the body and blood are believed 'to be in it.' Hence the form is seen, broken, tasted, smelt, received. Christ's body and blood there (present) do not undergo these things... Or Christ's body is believed to be there hidden under the appearance of another thing. Whence the church sings, 'What you take not, what you see not, Let vigorous 'faith hold firmly.' Also 'When at last the sacramental bread 'has been broken, Waver not but remember, That as much is 'comprehended in a little piece, As is covered by the whole.' (3) John vi. (a), 'He remains in Me and I in him,' (b) 'He shall 'not die for ever,' (c) 'He shall have eternal life.' There are other causes for communicating, that lie midway before these come to pass: as to be purged from sins, to advance in virtues, to be freed from punishment in purgatory (lit. purgatorial penalty), a debt of suffering which man owes, to be strengthened against enemies (*i.e.* the world, the flesh and the devil), to weaken the power of temptations in themselves, to advantage the living and the dead, to gladden angels and saints in Heaven, to get nearer to the Kingdom of Heaven [above], to be ready to die for Christ, to rejoice spiritually in Christ Himself, to be illuminated in the Spirit, and cheerfully to wait for (one's call to) the Kingdom of God. Behold, dearest friend, thou wilt (thus) prepare thyself to eat the Lord's body. [A passage of sublime piety. His doctrinal clouds shut not out, they scarcely seem to dim the light shining on him from the country to which he feels that he will soon be summoned. How different from the fears of the poor

---

quo me veritatis inimici mendaciter accusarunt. Ulterius est secundum quod in sacramento venerabili aliud sentitur et aliud creditur. Istud per beatum Aug. de Con. Dist. 2, "Nam sentitur species sacramentalis "et creditur in ipsâ corpus et sanguis Christi." Unde species videtur frangitur gustatur odoratur percipitur. Non hæc ibi corpus Christi vel sanguis patitur... Vel corpus Christi creditur sub alienâ specie occultatum. Unde canit ecclesia, "Quod non capis quod non vides, Animosa firmet fides," &c. Item "Fracto demum sacramento Non vacilles sed "memento Tantum esse sub fragmento Quantum toto tegitur." (50) John vi. (a) "In Me manet et Ego in eo," (b) "non morietur in æternum," (c) "habebit vitam æternam." Sunt aliæ causæ (communicationis) ad istas mediæ; ut purgari a peccatis, proficere in virtutibus, liberari a pœnâ purgatoriâ, quam deberet homo pati, fortificari contra hostes (scilicet mundum carnem et diabolum), debilitare in se tentationes; prodesse vivis et mortuis, lætificare angelos et sanctos in cælo, propinquari cælorum regno, *paratum esse mori pro Christo*, gaudere spiritualiter in Ipso, illuminari in Spiritu, et expectare hilariter regnum Dei. Ecce cha-

pope who fled from the city!] (4) He ought to prove himself in faith, in hope, in love, also in the moral virtues... It must also be known that the eating of Christ's body, and in like manner the drinking (of His blood), *is a kind of spiritual (eating and drinking) ONLY*, and it is to abide in Christ and to have Christ abiding in him, and men are bound to (obtain) that spiritual eating and drinking under the penalty of being deprived of eternal life, John vi. [Note. This delightful truth *may* be held with transubstantiation. It is not necessarily incompatible. It is something over and above, which Christ gave even in that darkness to His own. See also Savonarola and we hope such as Dr Pusey.] The second eating of the body and drinking, &c. is only sacramental (*i. e.* of the sign only)... as did Judas Iscariot ... Such an one remains not in Christ by grace. Augustine hints this, 'He that eateth not (outwardly) eateth (inwardly): and he that eateth eateth not.' The third is eating and drinking in a sacramental and spiritual way too... He eats worthily... he then receives the sacrament and the real object of the sacrament, which is *grace*, by which he is united to Christ. [Remember the good in P. Lombard.] The first eating will be perpetual, because the saints will perpetually abide in Christ and will have Him abiding in them. The second will not be perpetual, but will run on, as I reckon, unto the very day of judgment, as also will the bad Christians unworthily eating the body of the Lord Jesus Christ. The third ought to last among Christians until the very day of the coming of the judgment (1 Cor. xi., As often as, &c.). The first eating all men ought to have. As to the second they ought to use great caution; and devoutly and humbly to

---

rissime te ad manducationem corpus Domini præparabis. (4) Probare se debet in fide in spe in charitate etiam in virtutibus moralibus ... Est etiam sciendum quod manducatio corporis Christi, similiter et bibitio, quædam est spiritualis tantum, quæ est in Christo manere et Christum manentem in se habere... et ad istam spiritualem manducationem et bibitionem obligantur sub privatione vitæ æternæ homines. John vi. Unless ye eat, &c. Secunda manducatio corporis et bibitio, &c., est tantum sacramentalis... ut fecit Judas Iscarioth... Non manet in Christo per gratiam... Innuit... Aug. "Non manducans manducat "et manducans non manducat." Tertia manducatio et bibitio est sacramentalis et spiritualis... Digne manducat... tunc recipit sacramentum... et rem sacramenti *quæ est gratia, quâ unitur Domino Jesu Christo*. Prima manducatio erit perpetua, quia perpetue sancti manebunt in Christo et Ipsum manentem in se habebunt. Secunda non erit perpetua, sed curret ut æstimo usque ad diem judicii, sicut et mali christiani indigne manducantes corpus Domini Jesu Christi. Tertia debet durare in Christianis usque ad diem adventus judicii (1 Cor. xi., As often as, &c.). Primam manducationem debent omnes homines habere. Secundam deberent valde cavere. Et tertiam devote et hu-



frequent the third. But alas! that third, I say, lost its frequency with many, from the time in which the first either totally vanished or was very much chilled in (Christians) themselves, Matt. xxiv. Because iniquity shall abound, &c. [Ending of the peroration.] Alas to those who are sick of the saving (healthful) and most sweet food. And the days which by the propitious grace of God in Christ, dearest brother, are now days of salvation and penitence. Let us therefore, putting off the old man, labour with the whole desire of our hearts, that at the approaching Easter-day, we may with chaste body, clean heart and pure conscience be able to eat the eternal supper of the Lord not unto judgment to us but unto eternal life. Which may Jesus Christ the true God, Son of God and of the Virgin Mary, grant to us, Who to the ages of ages is blessed. Amen.

*From the second life of Jerome of Prague at the end of the Works of Huss.*

P. 530. "When he was asked by some one, what were his opinions on the sacrament of the altar, he said, Before it is consecrated it is bread and wine, but after it is consecrated it is Christ's body and blood, after the utterance of those words on it, which the true faith counts essentially necessary. But lo! another rises and says, It is indeed most extensively reported about you, that you hold the opinion that it is bread upon the altar. He playfully replied, I for my part believe that bread is to be found in the baker's shops, not in the sacrament of the altar.

militar frequentare. Sed heu! ista scilicet tertia in multis frequentationem non habuit, ex eo quia prima in ipsis evanuit totaliter vel multum refriguit... Matt. xxiv., Because iniquity, &c., &c. The peroration ends thus, Væ illis qui nauseant super cibo salutifero et dulcissimo. ... Et qui propitiâ Divinitatis gratiâ in Christo, frater charissime, jam sunt dies salutis et pœnitentiæ; igitur exuentes veterem hominem laboremus toto cordis desiderio, ut ad diem Paschæ (quod propinquat) cum casto corpore, mundo corde, et pura conscientiâ possimus non nobis in iudicium sed in vitam æternam cœnam Dominicam manducare. Quod nobis præstare dignetur Jesus Christus verus Deus, Dei et Mariæ virginis Filius, in sæculorum sæcula benedictus. Amen.

P. 530.

Rogatus a quopiam, ecquid de sacramento altaris sentiret? "Ante consecrationem," inquit, "est panis et vinum, post consecrationem verum corpus et sanguis Christi, adjectis insuper verbis quæ sincerâ fides exigit." Ecce autem alius surgens ait, "Maximus sane rumor est de te, quod in eâ sis opinione ut credas panem esse in altari." Ille festive respondit, "Credo equidem panem apud pistorem esse, non in sacramento altaris."

*From his Abjuration in the first life.*

P. 524. "But I assent to the decisions of the holy Roman church and apostolic seat, and of this sacred council, and with my mouth and heart I profess this in all points and through all matters, and especially concerning the power of the keys and the doctrine of the sacraments, &c., as the church of Rome and apostolic seat, and this sacred council profess, &c.

P. 526. "I call God to witness and protest to you that I believe and hold all the articles of faith as the holy catholic church believes and holds them, &c. But after the said sermon had been finished by the said bishop Laud, then Mr Jerome among other things again said to them, Ye decide to condemn me without right or justice; and I shall after my death leave remorse in your consciences, and a nail fastened in your hearts, and I summon you all to answer me before the Most High and most Just Judge within a hundred years from this time."

*From his first Protest.*

P. 522. "If after I have come to you thus, and surrendered myself to your justice, any arrest of my person or making me prisoner, or violence be used to me without proof of any fault of mine, it would thenceforward be plain to the world that this general council is not proceeding by the rules of justice and fairness; if, that is, it should in any manner deny to me the highest and most rigid justice, coming as I did of my own accord

*P. 524. C. III.*

Consentio autem sanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ et apostolicæ sedi et huic sacro concilio, et ore ac corde profiteor in omnibus et per omnia et præsertim de clavibus sacramentis, &c., prout ipsa Romana ecclesia et apostolica sedes et hoc sacrum concilium profitentur, &c.

*P. 526. C. V.*

Testor Deum et protestor vobiscum quod omnes articulos fidei credo et teneo sicut sancta catholica credit et tenet ecclesia, &c. C. VI. Postquam vero dictum sermonem episcopus Laudensis jam dictus finivisset, extunc M. Hieronymus iterum inter cætera dixit ad eos, "Vos vultis me condemnare inique et injuste: et ego post mortem meam relinquam in conscientia vestra remorsum et clavum in cordibus vestris, et cito vos omnes ut respondeatis mihi coram Altissimo et Justissimo Judice infra centum annos."

*P. 522. C. I.*

Si mihi venienti et me tantæ æquitati offerenti, ante probationem cujusquam culpæ arrestatio vel captivatio vel violentia fieret, extunc toti mundo patesceret, quod hoc generale concilium non secundum justitiam atque æquitatem procederet: si me sponte et libere venientem a tam altâ

and at full liberty: and this I think will be far from what this very sacred council of wise men will do."

By this evidence Jerome as well as Huss claimed to be justified as holders of all received doctrines of the Roman church and of transubstantiation—*i.e.* the change of the substance of the bread and wine—in particular. Their condemnation and punishment were therefore most unjustifiable.

---

*et rigidâ æquitate quovis modo repelleret: quod utique longe a tam sacro sapientum concilio puto relegatum.*

(H.) JOHN CHARLIER DE GERSON, born in Champagne.

B. 1363. D. 1429.

One of the leading minds of the age; one who had reached true spiritual personal piety; and one who was capable to a great extent of dealing with and truly healing the diseased state of Christendom. If Cranmer was eminent for worldly wisdom when he referred to the universities Henry's dispute with the pope on the legitimacy of his marriage with his brother's widow, Gerson was not a whit less worldly-wise when, in conjunction with Peter d'Ailly who had been his teacher, and Nicolas Clemangis his friend and co-student, he broke the theory of Papal Supremacy by raising the counter idea of the supremacy of Councils. France raised civil lawyers to controvert the Roman Curia in the time of Philip Augustus; and now France originated this new invasion of the hitherto paramount lordship of the pope over Christendom. The fact seems to have been that the divers and unending varieties of utter corruption exhibited by the successive tenants of the papal chair, and the system of extortion and oppression over all the subject nations, which these popes had built up around themselves, had well-nigh worn out the forbearance of Christendom. The Reformation was nearly come. It only needed to be put on a right basis as to doctrine. This was the destined work of men in the 14th and 15th centuries; and then it was brought into full popular view by men equal to the task in the 16th century. But Gerson and some others had to perform their preliminary work in the two prior centuries. His *Summa* is excellent, and all his publications are

stamped with those superior qualities which won him the high title Doctor Christianissimus. He is the leading figure of the age, and he is Chancellor of Paris and leader of the Sorbonne. But after fatal Constance, he spent the remainder of his days in religious retirement, doubtless with the fate of Huss and Jerome weighing heavily on his mind. Commentaries on the Psalms, and other remaining devotional works, are the fit fruits of that period; and a great effort has been made to detach the 'Imitation of Christ' from its received author, and to attach the honour of that popular work to Gerson's crown of pious glory. One would at once have pronounced it of far too superstitious a character, and too faintly exhibitiv of the Atonement to be Gerson's. It seems much more the production of a solitary. If we may venture to analyse Gerson's feelings, we might say that his whole heart was *filled* with a yearning desire for the much-needed reform of Christendom; and thus the maintenance of the claims of sacred liberty assailed in the person of Huss seemed to him an interference with his great object: so he thrust them aside; and though the spirit of reform gained by the movement, it closed with an almost ridiculous failure when after cashiering the two anti-popes Benedict and Gregory, it put itself under the feet of Martin V. and was ignominiously suspended.

P. 227. "Christ holds Himself in His hands (Augustine). He feeds Himself, being Himself the food... We must say that in His own proper appearance He in a certain way stands apart from Himself under the appearance of the sacrament; since in His own proper appearance He is in Heaven, but under the appearance of the sacrament He is on the altar; and according to this mode it is not inconsistent that He takes (up) Himself... Conclusion, Christ ate Himself in the supper on Holy Thursday... Bread and wine are the material of this sacrament. The cause of its institution may be manifold. One, that those two things

---

*Summa Theologicæ, p. 227. Venice, 1587.*

Se tenet in manibus. Se cibât Ipse cibus ... Dicendum est quod sub specie propriâ quodammodo distat a Seipso sub specie sacramenti: quoniam nunc in specie propriâ est in cælo, sed *sub specie sacramenti* est in altari; et secundum hunc modum non est inconveniens quod *Seipsum assumat*. [P. 228.] Conclusio. Christus manducavit Seipsum in cenâ in die Jovis sanctâ... Panis et vinum sunt materia hujus sacramenti. Causa institutionis potest esse multiplex. Una quia ista duo convenientius in cibo et

come very conveniently as food. Another cause, Bread sustains the body and wine makes the heart glad. Third, They are clean things to handle, and fourth, It is a matter with two sides ; that is, There is a true body of Christ, and there is a mystical... from many collected into one—bread from many grains—wine from many grapes or bunches. A fifth, The grains (are prepared) in the corn-floor, the bread in the furnace, the wine in the press ; which all concur to represent Christ's passion... The body put in the pyx on the day of the supper dies the next day on the cross. All sufferings are possible inwardly in the sacrament of Christ's body, which are possible to it under His own proper appearance, as to die, to suffer pain, and the like, not the external sufferings by beating, by hanging.

P. 254. " 'This' (My body) proves or shews the substance of the bread, which by virtue of the word instantaneously passes into Christ's body. Therefore that prayer of (consecration) is not only indicative but operative too, because it is in truth shewn to be bread, but under accidents perceptible by the senses, and the bread indeed truly passes into Christ's body by virtue of the operative word. That word 'is' is placed there (This is, &c.) because that form is operative, not an operation afterwards but instantaneous [see last extracts]... For this reason it is 'is,' not 'will be'... That word 'is' does not set forth to us there a pretence (*i.e.* a figure) but the truth of the conversion of the bread into Christ's body... That conversion takes place suddenly

potu veniunt. Alia causa, Panis sustentat corpus, et vinum cor lætificat. Tertia, Mundus tractantur, Quarta, Duplex est res ; scilicet corpus Christi verum et corpus Christi mysticum ... ex multis aggregatis in unum—panis ex multis granis—vinum ex multis uvis seu racemis. Quinta, Grana in aræa, panis in fornace, vinum in torculari—quæ omnia competunt ad representandam passionem Christi. [P. 229.] Corpus in pyxide positum in die cœnæ in crastino moritur in cruce. Omnes passionem intrinsece competunt corporis Christi sub sacramento, quæ Ei competunt sub specie propriâ, sicut mori, dolorem pati, et similia, non passionem extrinsecæ verberatu laqueatu.

P. 254.

"Hoc" (corpus Meum) demonstrat substantiam panis qui virtute verbi transit in corpus Christi instantaneæ. Ideo ea oratio non solum est indicativa sed etiam operativa, propter quod vere demonstratur panis, sed sub accidentibus sensualibus, qui quidem panis vere transit in corpus Christi virtute verbi operativi [I have written verbi, not Verbi]... Ponitur ibi istud verbum "est" quod ista forma est operativa non operatione successivâ sed instantaneâ. Propter hoc "est" non "erit"... Illud verbum "est" non notat ibi simulationem sed veritatem conversionis panis in corpus Christi... C. Conversio illa fit subito... Licet

... Although the utterance of the word (This is my body) is accomplished by successive acts of pronunciation, yet that conversion takes place by the uncreated Word Who works in an instant: whence it is certain that when the whole has been said the whole has been done... But when the Lord has (actually) done it He only knows... He spake the words but once, but gave them virtue (for ever).

P. 259. It is according to God to be in every place simply and in His own proper nature. It is according to a creature to be in one place only. But the body of Christ has a mode of existence between the two. For as it is a creature it cannot be made equal to God in that it is in every place; but as it has been made one with the Godhead, it ought to excel all other bodies in this that it can under the sacrament of the altar be in very many places at once [*i. e.* an assumption is to be made in opposition to all *à priori* or inductive conclusions regarding the laws of matter, because it is to be stoutly denied (without any ground for such denial) that Christ could have meant This is My body, &c. in a figurative sense].

P. 226. "The mode of using this sacrament is to eat it: which requires for completeness both eating and drinking... Yet on account of the risk which attends the pouring out of blood (wine) [*i. e.* the risk of spilling some part] it is ministered to the people under the form (appearance) of bread; and under this form there is the whole Christ. There is also another cause; because if it were ministered to the people under both forms

prolatio verbi fit successiva, tamen illa conversio fit per Verbum increatum, quod operatur in instanti, unde certum est quod quando totum dictum est totum factum est ... Sed quando Dominus faciat, Ipse solus novit. Semel verba dixit, eis dando virtutem, p. 255.

P. 259.

Deo convenit esse ubique simpliciter et proprie. Creaturæ convenit esse in uno loco tantum. Corpus Christi autem medio modo se habet. Cum enim sit creatura, non debet æquari Creatori in hoc quod ubique; cum vero unitatum est Divinitate, debet in hoc excellere alia corpora ut simul in locis plurimis possit esse sub sacramento altaris [and this utterly unphilosophical assertion rests upon nothing but a determination of brass that they will not allow that Christ can have spoken "in a figure" in this instance, though He did confessedly in a thousand others].

P. 226.

Usus hujus sacramenti est manducatio quæ ad sui integritatem et cibum et potum exigit... Tamen *propter periculum effusionis sanguinis* populo ministratur sub specie panis; sub quâ specie est totus Christus. Item est alia causa—quia si ministraretur populo sub utraque specie

common people would not believe that there is the whole Christ, (or a whole Christ) under each kind [appearance, species, or form] [What reasons in excuse for not conforming to Christ's command! but Gerson adds] according to Bonaventure. [Why did not our Lord foresee these risks, and institute it differently, or at least explain by St Paul that communion for the simple was to be in one kind?]

*Compendium of Theology. Tract III., on the seven sacraments of the Church.*

P. 270. (1) "On the time of instituting the Lord's supper. It was fully instituted on the day of the supper, and the words of consecration have had full efficacy as they now have, from that time until now. (2) What is the benefit? As man lost life by using the forbidden tree, so he recovers (it) by eating of the tree of life... That this may be a kind of spiritual nutriment to man. Ps. lxxvii. (lxxviii.) 25. Man did eat angels' food... That the members of the body of Christ may be united to their own head. Augustine. That the merit of faith may be increased since it is most chiefly earned in this sacrament. Pet. Lombard. The raising up of a hope that in heaven we may receive the gifts of Christ, since here we are receiving His own self. Chrysostom. The expansion of love, which is increased by receiving this sacrament. Hilary. A diminution of venial sins. (3) On the material of the sacrament 'Wine mixed with water.' Pope Alexander. On this authority, water is reckoned (to have been) with the wine in the cup although it is not (so) read in the Gospel. Not without great sin is [the Lord's body] made from leavened bread. The question is asked whether the bread passes [is changed] into flesh, soul, blood and

---

simplices non crederent totum esse Christum in alterâ specie secundum Bonaventuram.

In *Gerson's Compendium Theologiæ, Opera, Paris, 1706, Tract. III., de VII. sacramentis Ecclesiæ, Vol. I., p. 270—4, de sac. Euch.*

(1) De tempore institutionis. In die cœnæ plene institutum fuit et habuerunt verba consecrationis plenam efficaciam a tempore illo usque nunc, quantam modo habent. (2) Quæ sit utilitas? Sicut homo per usum ligni vetiti perdidit vitam, ita recuperet per esum ligni vitæ... Ut hic sit aliquod nutrimentum hominis spirituale, Ps. lxxvii. 25. Ut uniantur membra corporis Christi suo Capiti.... Aug. Confess.... Ut augeatur meritum fidei, quæ in hoc sacramento maxime meretur, Pet. Lomb.... Sublevatio spei ut recipiamus in cœlo Sua, quo hic recipimus Semetipsum. Chrysost. ...Dilatatio charitatis, quæ hujus sacramenti sumptione augetur...Hilar...Diminutio venialium. (3) De materiâ sacramenti...Alex. Papa..."vinum aquâ permistum..." Unde quamvis non legatur in evangelio, æstimatur tamen aqua simul cum vino in calice Domini fuisse... Non sine gravi peccato conficitur de fermentato... Quæritur an panis transeat in carnem, animam, sanguinem et Deitatem ;

Godhead: and similarly of the wine. There is a whole Christ under each kind: but nevertheless the bread passes into flesh, the wine into blood. But because the whole Christ is inseparable (from Himself), therefore under the 'kind' [appearance, form, &c.] of bread it is by conversion and transubstantiation flesh and blood, and soul and Godhead by concomitance, so that His flesh is never without blood, soul and Deity. [Removing the charm of the word concomitancy this reasoning is simple assertion: it is an identical proposition. There is soul, blood, &c., because these are with it.] For by the 'virtue' of the words [This is My body] it is the flesh of Christ, principally and by consequence all Christ's other (parts). Whence the whole Christ is there by the virtue of the words; but yet the flesh principally and the rest by consequence (*i. e.* by logical following): so also of the wine. (4) The precise form of 'the words.' It is 'This is My body' and no more, as is the opinion of nearly all (divines). 'Take, eat,' belongs to the use and does not affect the completion. The form in the consecration of the blood. 'This is the cup of My new 'and eternal testament (covenant), the mystery of faith, which 'will be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins.' Where, although all these words in this order are not read in the Gospel, yet it must be believed that the church has these words by special tradition of the Lord, 1 Cor. xi. 23. And because the form of those words was vehemently impressed on the hearts of the disciples and was in daily use, therefore it has not been so diligently written (down) by the apostles, as it was done and said by Christ, and Damascenus seems to mean this. (5) What is the effect? Double according to Peter Lomb.: the augmenta-

---

et similiter vinum... Totus Christus est sub utrâque specie: sed tamen panis transit in carnem, vinum in sanguinem. Sed quia totus Christus inseparabilis est, ideo sub specie panis est caro per conversionem et transubstantiationem, et sanguis et anima et Deitas per concomitantiam, eo quod caro Ejus sine sanguine animâ et Deitate nunquam sit. Virtute enim verborum est principaliter ibi caro et consequenter cætera omnia Christi. Unde Christus totus est ibi verborum virtute, sed tamen caro principaliter, et cætera consequenter: so also of the wine, (4)...forma verborum præcisa... Hæc est, "Hoc est corpus Meum," et nihil amplius, ut volunt fere omnes... "accipite et comedite" ad usum pertinet... Non ad confectionem. Forma in consecratione sanguinis "Hic est calix sanguinis Mei novi et æterni testamenti, mysterium fidei, quod "pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum." Ubi quamvis non legantur omnia verba hæc seriatim in evangelio, credendum tamen est quod illa habeat ecclesia ex speciali traditione Domini, 1 Cor. xi. 23. Et quia forma verborum illorum vehementer impressa fuit cordibus discipulorum, et in quotidiano usu, ideo non est adeo diligenter ab apostolis scriptum, sicut fuit a Christo factum et dictum, ut videtur velle Damascenus. (5) Quis sit effectus... Duplex secundum Pet.



tion of love, and the diminution of infirmity, *i. e.* of venial sin. (6) Concerning the truth of the body of Christ. In what way after the breaking of the bread has been done, is the whole Christ under every particle, Who was before whole under the unbroken host (victim). Also if the body of Christ enters into the stomach, and if it is itself as long as it is there. (7) On the quality or condition of the recipients. (8) On the same regarding the minister: He must not 'celebrate' after drinking water, because all food, as we customarily use the term 'food,' goes into the stomach, though it be not converted into body, and (so) breaks the fast and hinders the celebration.

P. 475. "Whether angels, the blessed virgin and all male and female saints are associated with (accompany, attend upon) the body of Christ in the sacrament of the altar?

P. 1285. "Sermon on the eucharist on Corpus Christi day. And infidelity (*i. e.* such as do not hold Roman doctrine) adduced many frivolous reasons, saying, that God cannot do so, *i. e.* (as doubting) as to His power, wisdom and benevolence that bread should be changed into flesh—that a thing so great could be contained under so small a thing—and that one and the same body could be in so many places. Besides, that consecrated bread is not different from bread not consecrated—to prevent its becoming corrupt; and yet it is the immortal God. Lastly, they do not see God's benevolence, since it is said that bad recipients of it

Lomb. ... charitatis augmentum, et infirmitatis, hoc est, venialis peccati diminutionem. (6) De vero corpore Christi. Qualiter... post fractionem factam ... totus Christus sit sub qualibet particulâ, Qui prius totus fuit sub totâ hostiâ. Item si corpus Christi in ventrem intret, et si sic quamdiu ibi existat. (7) De qualitate seu conditione recipientium. (8) De iisdem ministri ... Post potum aquæ non est celebrandum, eo quod omnis cibus, quem usualiter cibum vocamus, transit in ventrem etsi non convertatur in corpus, frangit jejunium, et impedit celebrationem.

P. 475.

An angeli, beata virgo et omnes sancti et sanctæ associant corpus Christi in sacramento altaris?

Vol. III. P. 1285.

Sermo in die corporis Christi de Euch. Et adducebat infidelitas (*i. e.* qui non ecclesiæ Rom. credunt) multas rationes frivolas, dicens, Deum sic facere non posse, secundum potentiam Suam sapientiam et benevolentiam quod panis mutaretur in carnem quod res tam magna sub tam parvâ re contineretur et quod unum idemque corpus in tot esset locis. Insuper quod panis consecratus nullam a non consecrato habet differentiam quin corruptioni subjectus sit: et tamen Deus immortalis est. Demum non videre benevolentiam cum, ut dicitur, mali efficiantur

only become worse. And in what way could good recipients be made better, as to the soul, by a bodily food, which does not enter into that soul? For this reason, say the unbelievers, it is not wonderful if we ask, How this happens? But yet to all these arguments and the like, theology has not deigned to give an answer. Yea she has said that these unbelievers are not worthy of such mysteries being cleared up in their presence, &c. This would be putting 'pearls before swine, and giving that 'which is holy to dogs.' Theology has said moreover that this mystery can never be fully understood without the light of faith. 'If ye will not believe, ye shall not understand,' &c. Lastly, theology has sent unbelievers to the schools, &c. &c. The household of St Louis (the king) told him to go and see a miracle performed in proof of the holy sacrament. 'Why should I go?' he answered, 'I well believe in the sacrament without the miracle.' The answer in truth of a good and firm Christian.

P. 1289. "Reason ought to correct the judgment of the bodily senses. You see that the sun would by the eye be judged just two feet in diameter. A stick part in the water and part out appears to be broken. A single bean felt by the fingers crossing each other appears to be two; and so in a thousand illusions of the senses reason is the corrector. [What reason according to modern science can be given for some accidents of bread remaining when the substance is said to be changed? So he says.] But reason itself wants to be directed by the light of the highest truth. I say that it is just in the same way regarding this holy sacrament. But these unbelievers are

---

peiores. Et boni quo pacto meliores efficerentur, quoad animam, per corporalem escam, quæ animam illam non intrat? Quapropter non mirandum est, ait infidelitas, si quæram "Quomodo," &c. Sed *ad omnia hæc argumenta* et similia non fuit dignata respondere theologia. Immo dixit obstinatum infidelitatem dignam non esse quod talia coram eâ declararentur mysteria, &c. Hoc est "ponere margaritas ad porcorum pedes et sanctum dare canibus." Dixit insuper nunquam mysterium hoc *intelligi posse plene* sine fidei lumine. Nisi credideritis non intelligetis, &c. Postremo theologia misit infidelitatem ad scholas, &c., &c. Dixerunt familiares Sancto Ludovico, ut iret visum miraculum (in sancti sacramenti approbationem). "Quare irem?" respondit, &c. "Bene credo sacramentum absque hoc, &c." Revera responsio boni et firmi Christiani.

P. 1289.

Ratio corrigere debet corporis iudicium. Videtis solem ab oculo duorum pedum duntaxat judicari. Baculus partim in aquâ et partim in aere fractus apparet. Unica faba sub digitis supra se invicem positus apparet duæ; et sic de mille illusionibus corrigit ratio. *Ratio autem dirigi debet* per summæ veritatis lumen. *Pariformiter* dico in hoc

but beasts with shoes on, who won't believe any thing but what they can measure by the body and its senses.' [Then why send us to reason by the senses if we are to be blamed for reasoning upon the basis of their evidence? I cannot escape the conviction that the greatest doctor of the Sorbonne is playing off his irony against the absurdities of the belief he was obliged to profess, in the former of the last two extracts, and it is not quite easy to conceive that he felt sure of the truth of the last.]

---

sacramento sancto. [Then he adds] *Hi bestiæ sunt calciatæ, qui nihil volunt credere nisi quod corpore sentiunt.*

(I.) THOMAS À KEMPIS. B. 1379. D. 1471.

He was sub-prior of a convent of St Agnes, of which his brother John was prior. Hagenbach says that Silbert of Vienna, after discussing the evidence as to the authorship of the treatise *De Imitatione Christi*, gives verdict in favour of the received author, and not of Chancellor Gerson or Abbot Gersen. He takes his name from Kempen (Campo), his birthplace in the diocese of Cologne; but his true name is Thomas Hamermerk. His Latin works include several other treatises. The one feature about him is that he endeavoured to draw religion off from a trust in mere mechanical church ordinances, which were so multiplied as to bring the people's consciences, or at least their account of them, under the hands of the clergy in all the details of life, and that he tried to place men on the much higher level of personal affection to Christ Himself. They were to be won by contemplating Christ's perfect pattern of human life, and drawn to pray for grace to tread in His steps. A high elevation indeed in comparison of the former. But it was still salvation by works. Faith in the Atonement of Christ for our sins is to become the next picture on the Reformation canvas: but it appears in the works of Thomas Hamermerk, as far as I have gone, very dimly indeed. Gieseler says there have been 2000 editions of the original, and that it has been translated into very many languages, and that there have been above 1000 editions of the French translation alone. Bacon doubts a wide circulation being a proof of truth, saying that alloy debases gold

indeed, but makes it work the better. But the spread of John Bunyan's one great work makes one deem Bacon's saying after all a baseless reproach against man and his conscience of truth. I do not think I see as much deep devotion in the building up of expressions of benefit derived to the glory of this sacrament in this writer, as in the few ardent words in which Jerome Savonarola speaks in its praise. In one of the following extracts where à Kempis says, "I offer all "the pious desires of devoted saints, &c. &c., dead and living," I shrink and almost shiver at the wicked trenching on our Saviour's heavenly work—which the assumption of a priestly office under Christianity involves—and at the way in which it here comes out to view. The large extract from his 32nd sermon, saving just the least touch of solitarism, is worthy of any age of the church: and it was a bright forerunner of much good spiritual theology to come. His other treatises are numerous and my Latin edition closes with several lives, I suppose of his followers.

He went in 1395 to the school of Deventer, Erasmus' birth-place; and in 1400 he was made canon of an Augustinian convent, where his brother was prior, in the diocese of Utrecht. A papal interdict on the diocese drove him to Arnheim where he lost his brother, but he was restored to his post of sub-prior in 1448, in his 69th year, and death did not carry him off for 23 years. One of his eulogists, Bishop Malou of Bruges, once professor of Louvain, marks among his characteristics that he loved to enkindle the affections of men rather than to sharpen their understandings. But he busily worked at making copies of good books. In 1417 he transcribed both the Bible and the Missal, and he often made copies of his own books to give to his brother monks. It may be noticed that the title to his great work properly belongs to the first chapter, and each chapter has a title of its own. The work has been often sold as four separate treatises; and when bound together as such, they stood in a different order from that which they now hold. The entire work has been printed not only as the composition of Gerson, but as St Bonaventure's, and even as St Bernard's. The names of both Bellarmine and Cajetan appear in the controversy. But internal evidence also confirms it to Thomas, and the balance of external evidence is far from making a case against him.

§ 3. "Lo! Noah, a just man, laboured in the building of the ark a hundred years, that he might with a few be saved; and I, how shall I be able in one hour to prepare to take with reverence the Fabricator of the world?... Many run to divers places to visit the relics of the saints, and wonder when they hear of their exploits. They look at the ample buildings of their temples and kiss their sacred bones wrapped in silks and gold. And lo! Thou art present here in my dwelling on the altar, my God, Holy of holy ones, Creator of all things, and Lord of the angels, &c. But here in the sacrament of the altar Thou art the wholly present God, my man Christ Jesus, where even more abundantly the fruit of eternal salvation is received as often as Thou shalt have been devoutly and worthily taken. O admirable and hidden grace of the sacrament, &c.! In this sacrament spiritual grace is conferred, lost excellence is repaired in the mind, and beauty deformed by sin returns. This grace is sometimes so great, that from the fulness of the devotion conferred, not the mind only but the weak body also feels larger strength supplied to itself.

§ 6. "As often as thou again honourest this mystery and receivest Christ's body, so often thou accomplishest the work of thy redemption, and art made partaker of all the merits of Christ.

§ 2. "For this is the highest and most worthy sacrament, the health of the mind and the body, the medicine for every

*De imitatione Christi. Liber IV. Opera. Coloniae, 1680.*

*C. I. § 3.*

Ecce Noe vir justus in arcæ fabricâ centum annis laboravit, ut cum paucis salvaretur: et ego quomodo me potero unâ horâ præparare ut *mundi Fabricatorem* cum reverentiâ sumam?... § 8. Currunt multi ad diversa loca pro visitandis reliquiis sanctorum et mirantur auditis gestis eorum. Ampla ædificia templorum inspiciunt et osculantur sericis et auro involuta sacra ossa ipsorum. Et ecce Tu præsens es, hic apud me in altari, Deus meus, sanctus sanctorum, Creator omnium et Dominus angelorum, &c. Hic autem in sacramento altaris totus præsens es Deus, meus homo Christus Jesus, ubi et copiosius percipitur æternæ salutis fructus, quotiescumque frueris [lege fueris] devote et digne susceptus. § 10. O admirabilis et abscondita gratia sacramenti, &c.! In hoc sacramento *confertur* spiritualis gratia, reparatur in animo virtus amissa, et per peccatum deformata redit pulchritudo. Tanta est aliquando hæc gratia, ut ex plenitudine collatæ devotionis non tantum mens sed et debile corpus vires sibi præstitas sentit ampliores.

*C. II. § 6.*

Quoties hoc mysterium recolis et Christi corpus accipis, toties *tux redemptionis opus agis* et particeps omnium meritorum Christi efficeris.

*C. IV. § 2.*

Est enim hoc altissimum et dignissimum sacramentum, salus animæ et corporis, medicina omnis spiritualis languoris; in quo vitia mea

spiritual languor; in which my vices are cured, my passions are bridled, temptations are overcome or diminished, greater grace is poured in, virtue begun is increased, faith is confirmed, hope is strengthened, and love is inflamed and expanded. For Thou hast bestowed many good gifts, and still oftener bestowest them in the sacrament on Thy beloved ones devoutly communicating, my God, the taker up of my soul, the repairer of human infirmity, and the giver of all inward consolation. For Thou pourest into them much consolation against varied trouble, and raisest from the lowest deep of dejection to the hope of Thy protection, and inwardly refreshest and enlightenest them with a kind of new grace, that those who felt themselves at first in anxiety and destitute of affection before communicating, afterward, having been refreshed with heavenly food and drink, find themselves changed to a better condition.

§ 3. "When the priest celebrates he honours God, gladdens angels, edifies the church, assists the living, furnishes rest to the dead, and makes himself partaker of all good things.

§ 11. "That we ought to offer to God ourselves and all that we have and to pray for all.

§ 1. "Lord, all things are Thine, &c. Lord, in the simplicity of my heart I offer myself, &c. Take me with this holy oblation of Thy precious body: which to-day in the presence of angels (see Chrysostom), invisibly standing by, I offer to Thee,

curantur, passiones frenantur, tentationes vincuntur aut minuuntur, gratia major infunditur, virtus incepta augetur, firmatur fides, spes roboratur, et charitas ignescit, et dilatatur... § 3. Multa namque bona largitus es, et adhuc sæpius largiris in sacramento dilectis Tuis devote communicantibus, Deus meus, susceptor animæ meæ, reparator infirmitatis humanæ et totius dator consolationis internæ. Nam multam ipsis consolationem adversus variam tribulationem infundis et de imo dejectionis ad spem Tuæ protectionis erigis, atque novâ quâdam gratiâ eos intus recreas et illustras, ut, qui anxie primum et sine affectione se ante communionem senserant, postea refectione cibo potuque cælesti in melius se mutatos inveniant.

C. V. § 3.

Quando sacerdos celebrat, Deum honorat, angelos lætificat, ecclesiam ædificat, vivos adjuvat, defunctis requiem præstat et sese omnium bonorum participem efficit.

C. IX. § 11.

Quod nos et omnia nostra Deo debemus offerre, et pro omnibus orare.

C. XI. § 1.

Domine, omnia Tua sunt, &c. Domine, in simplicitate cordis mei offero meipsum, &c. Suscipe me cum hac sanctâ oblatione Tui pretiosi corporis quam Tibi hodie in præsentia angelorum invisibiliter assisten-

that it may be unto salvation for me and all Thy people... I offer to Thee also all the pious desires of those devoted persons, &c. of others, &c., each of whom have desired and requested prayers and masses to be said for themselves and all their own, whether they yet live in the flesh, or now are dead as to this world, that they all may feel the help of Thy grace the aid of Thy consolation come to them, and that, drawn out from the net of all evils, they may joyfully magnify Thee and pay Thee thanks... I offer to Thee also prayers and propitiatory sacrifices [victims of appeasing] for them who have injured me, &c.

§ 1. "I have Thee truly present in the sacrament, though hidden in the appearance of another thing... But when that which is perfect shall have come, the use of the sacrament shall cease, because the blessed in heavenly glory do not want sacramental medicine, for they rejoice without end in the presence of God, they taste the Word of God made flesh, as it was from the beginning and remains for ever... [These last expressions seem to come from the misunderstood expression in the Psalms 'angels' food.' To think of representing Christ's body as fed upon by angels in all ages past and future! Yet this is, less explicitly, asserted by several other divines.] Thou therefore gavest to me that am weak Thy sacred body for a refreshment of mind and body, and didst place Thy word as a lantern to my feet. Without these two I could not live. [Keble's Evening Hymn. He also may seem to translate 'cœlestis potus,' above, 'drink of heaven,' 'With angels' food their brethren greet And pour the drink 'of heaven.'] These may be called the two tables placed on this side and on that side in the treasury of the holy church.

---

tium offero, ut sit pro me et pro cuncto populo Tuo in salutem. § 3. Offero quoque Tibi omnia pia desideria devotorum, &c., aliorum, &c., qui orationes et missas pro se suisque omnibus dici a me desideraverunt et petierunt, sive in carne adhuc vivant, sive jam in seculo defuncti sunt, ut omnes sibi auxilium gratiæ Tuæ, opem consolationis, &c. advenire sentiant, et ut ab omnibus malis eretiti gratias Tibi magnificas læti persolvant. § 6. Offero etiam Tibi preces et hostias placationis pro illis specialiter qui me læserunt, &c.

#### C. XI. § 1.

Habeo Te in sacramento vere præsentem, quamvis alienâ specie occultum. § 2. Cum autem venerit quod perfectum est, cessabit usus sacramenti, quia beati in gloriâ cœlesti non egent medicamine sacramentali, gaudent enim sine fine in præsentia Dei, *gustant Verbum Dei carnem factum*, sicut fuit *ab initio* et manet in æternum. § 4. Dedisti itaque mihi infirmo sacrum corpus Tuum ad refectionem mentis et corporis, et posuisti lucernam pedibus meis verbum Tuum. Sine his duobus vivere non possem... Hæc possunt dici mensæ duæ, hinc et inde in gazophylacio sanctæ ecclesiæ positæ. Una mensa est sacri

One table is that of the sacred altar, having holy bread, *i.e.* the precious body of Christ. The other is that of the Divine law, &c. Thanks to Thee, Creator, Redeemer of men, Who to declare to the whole world Thy love [see Tyndall's magnificent image of a monument on a high hill] hast prepared a great supper, in which Thou hast set before them to be eaten not a typical lamb, but Thy most holy body and blood, gladdening all Thy faithful with a sacred feast and inebriating them (Ps. xxiii.) with the cup of salvation, in which are all the delights of paradise, and the holy angels feast with us [this is beyond what Chrysostom asserts] but with a happier sweetness of joy, &c. O how great and honourable is the office of priests, to whom it has been given [Keble again] to consecrate the Lord with the sacred words of majesty, with their lips to bless, with their hands to hold, with their own mouth to receive, and to minister to others, &c. Those eyes should be simple and modest [Jerome] that are wont to look on the body of Christ, those hands should be pure and raised to heaven which are accustomed to handle the Creator of heaven and earth.

§ 4. "Go on then with simple and undoubting faith, &c., approach to the sacraments. All reason and enquiry into nature ought to follow faith not go before it, nor to break away aught from it, for faith and love, &c. &c. God eternal and boundless and of infinite power does great and inscrutable things in heaven and earth, nor is there any investigation of His marvellous works.

P. 253. "On the Passover. Who is it then who celebrates

altaris, habens panem sanctum, *i.e.* *corpus Christi pretiosum*. Altera est Divinæ legis, &c.... Gratias Tibi, Creator ac Redemptor hominum, qui ad declarandam toti mundo charitatem Tuam cœnam parâsti magnam in quâ non agnum typicum sed Tuum sanctissimum corpus et sanguinem præposuisti manducandum, lætificans omnes fideles convivio sacro, et calice inebrians salutari, in quâ sunt omnes delitiæ paradisi, et *epulantur nobiscum* angeli sancti sed suavitate feliciori. § 6. O quam magnum et honorabile est officium sacerdotum, quibus datum est Dominum majestatis verbis sacris consecrare, labris benedicere, manibus tenere, ore proprio sumere, et cæteris ministrare, &c., &c. § 7. Oculi ejus simplices et pudici, *qui Christi corpus solent intueri*, manus puræ et in cælum elevatæ qui Creatorem cæli et terræ solent contrectare!

C. XVIII. § 4.

Perge ergo cum simplici et indubitata fide, &c., ad sacramenta accede. Omnis ratio et naturalis investigatio sequi fidem debet, non præcedere nec infringere, nam fides et amor, &c. § 5. Deus æternus et immensus infinitæque potentie facit magna et inscrutabilia in cælo et in terrâ, nec est investigatio mirabilium operum ejus.

Concio XXXII., p. 253, de Paschale.

Quis est ergo qui pascha in spiritu celebrat? Qui de vitiis in



the passover in spirit? He who passes over from vices to virtues, who rises from his old life and bad customs through a state of devotion new to him. Who is he who worthily honours the passover? He who despises the honours of the world and in all his own good acts seeks the glory of Christ. Who is he that sacrifices a kid for the evening of the passover? He that repents of his own sins, and ceases to sin afterwards. Who is he that eats a roast lamb with lettuces? He that thinks with pain of Christ suffering on the cross and chastens himself by living innocently. Who is the true Hebrew that passes the Red Sea? He that goes from fleshly sense to sweetness of spirit, and forgetting those things that are behind stretches after the things that are before. Who is a true son of Abraham? He that makes himself advance from slavish fear into the liberty of the sons of God. Who is a true disciple of Jesus? He that perfectly renounces all earthly things and relinquishes his own will. Who is worthy to sit at Christ's table? He that willingly (of his own accord) humbles himself for the love of Christ. Who is fit to enter the kingdom of heaven? He that despises the kingdom of the world and all the ornament of the age—this is a friend of God, a citizen of heaven and a lord of the world. Who is qualified to contemplate Christ's face and the innermost secret place of heaven? He that is clean in heart, fervid in prayer, and wholly given to things within. Who is beloved and accepted by God? He that is lowly in his own eyes, and sets little value on everything that is passing away."

---

virtutes transmigrat, qui de veteri vitâ et malâ consuetudine per novæ devotionis statum surgit. Quis est qui pascha digne honorat? Qui sæculares honores spernit, et gloriam Christi in cunctis bonis actibus suis quærit. Quis es qui hædum in vesperam paschæ immolat? Qui de peccatis suis pœnitet et de cætero peccare desistit. Quis est qui agnum assum cum lactucis manducat? Qui Christum in cruce passum dolenter cogitat, et innocenter vivendo se castigat. Quis est verus Hebræus qui Mare Rubrum transit? Qui de sensu carnis ad suavitatem spiritus pergit, et ea quæ retro sunt obliviscens ad anteriora se extendit. Quis est verus Abrahæ filius? Qui se timore servili in libertatem filiorum Dei proficit. Quis est verus Jesu discipulus? Qui omnibus terrenis perfecte renunciat et propriam voluntatem suam relinquit. Qui est dignus sedere ad mensam Christi? Qui sponte se humiliat pro amore Christi. Quis est aptus intrare regnum cælorum? Qui regnum mundi et omnem ornatum sæculi contemnit. Hic est amicus Dei, civis cœli, et dominus mundi. Quis est idoneus contemplari faciem Christi et penetrare secretum cœli? Qui mundus est corde, fervidus in oratione, ac totus internis deditus. Quis Deo dilectus et acceptus? Qui abjectus est in oculis suis et vilipendit omne quod transit. [Compare this with the yet more splendid passage in Origen, p. 86 of the First Volume.]

## THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY.

(A.) ALPHONSUS TOSTATUS, BISHOP OF AVILA IN SPAIN.

B. 1414. D. 1454.

THE remains of this author are equal in bulk to the whole of Chrysostom, the most voluminous of the fathers: but only seven parts of his Commentary on Matthew remain in about  $3\frac{1}{2}$  volumes folio, stopping in the midst of the Lord's supper and making us earnestly wish that half a volume more had survived to carry us with him through the very solemn remainder of our Lord's history at least in that one gospel. The editor closes his work at that juncture in the middle of the twelfth closely-printed folio volume, saying, "The rest on Matthew, owing to the calamity of "the times and the carelessness of men, are lost and regretted, "(perdita desiderantur)." He flourished in the time of Eugenius IV. Cardinal Ximenes is said to have borne the expense of printing his works; but no particular details are given. He is placed in a laudatory notice next after Augustine, Jerome, Isidore and Thomas Aquinas. Salamanca has the glory of his erudition; and he became bishop at 22 years of age. He filled civil offices as well; and both the number and the variety of his lost treatises are astonishing. Time changes terms, and we talk of an *iron* digestion: they say he had intestines of brass. He was never married except to his books and his work. I will add some of the names of his publications that seem for ever to have perished. On the five laws; *i. e.* those of Nature, Moses, the Gentiles, Mahomet and Christ; and on the truth that is in each. On Jurisdictions. On Prescription. On the Pope's power. On Reformation. On Indulgences. On a Saracen woman converted to the Jewish faith. On the Holy Land. On General Councils. On the error of the Calendar. Against the errors

of the Koran, and on Chronology. In his nineteenth volume are seven remaining treatises; one of which is on the State of the Soul after death. Vol. I. begins with a Commentary on Jerome's letter to Paulinus of Nola.

P. 499. "Why was the lamb eaten with wild lettuces, and why was this same ceremony preserved after the going out from Egypt? It was observed in the first celebration in Egypt because God so ordered it, and all things which were there commanded, were on that first occasion completed, although some of them have not been observed afterwards. Of the celebrations afterwards maintained it is clear that these points were there observed, Num. ix., for there (the book) treats of the celebration of the passover made in Mount Sinai in the second year after the departure from Egypt; and it is said 'with unleavened bread and wild lettuces shall (Israel) eat it.' Yet the cause of it seems to be this, that God gave them some vegetable food [lit. seasoning] to that food [the lamb] because we put seasoning to our food, and those herbs which we call lettuces were a seasoning for this flesh. Thirdly, to shew the bitterness and mental straits to which the Israelites were reduced in the going out, for the Egyptians would urge them, and they themselves would fear that death would be inflicted on them to revenge the slaying of the firstborn, and therefore great fear was seizing them in the going out, and held them after the going out when the Egyptians followed them as far as to the Red Sea, and thus, as if to mark that fear, God commanded that the lamb should

---

*Commentarium ad Matt. Cologne, 1613. Pars VII. Tom. XII.  
pars I., p. 499. Q. 38.*

Quare agnus cum lactucis agrestibus comedeatur et quare post exitum de Ægypto fuit servata hæc eadem ceremonia? Exod. xii. et Num. ix.? Servata fuit in primâ celebratione in Ægypto quia ita illud jussit Deus, Ex. xii., et omnia quæ ibi mandata sunt completa fuerunt illâ primâ vice, licet quædam illorum non fuerint postea observata. De celebrationibus postea factis quod (postea) fuerint ibi servata patet, Num. ix.; nam ibi agitur de celebratione Phase in Monte Sinai factâ anno secundo in exitu de Ægypto; et dicitur cum azymis et lactucis agrestibus comedet illud. Causa tamen hujus videtur esse, ut aliquod condimentum Deus daret illi cibo, quia cibis apponimus condimenta, et herbæ istæ quas lactucas dicimus erant condimentum pro carnibus his... Tertio ad ostendendum amaritudinem et angustiam animi quam haberent Israelitæ in exitu, nam Ægyptiî urgerent eos, et ipsi timerent sibi mortem inferri in vindictam primogenitorum occisorum, et ideo pavor magnus tenebat eos in exitu et tenuit eos post exitum, quando Ægyptiî insecuti sunt eos usque ad Mare Rubrum (Ex. xii. et xiv.): et ideo, sicut ad signandum pavorem illum, jussit Deus quod comederetur agnus cum

be eaten with unleavened bread; that is to say 'in seven days 'shalt thou eat the bread of affliction without leaven, since thou 'camest out from Egypt in fear,' &c. But after the going out from Egypt wild lettuces used to be eaten with the lamb generally to mark what had been done in Egypt; *i. e.* because they were eaten there they should be eaten afterwards too. But some one will say, Were all the lettuces eaten as also all the lamb that none of it might remain, and if any remained it should be burned (Ex. xii.)? It must be said two things were ceremonially used in eating the lamb; that is, wild lettuces and unleavened bread: and yet that custom was not observed with them, that was in use regarding the lamb, *i. e.* that the whole lamb should be burned. First, that concerning ceremonies the Jews were not allowed to add what had not been laid down (Deut. xii.); and yet God had not laid down that they should eat all the unleavened (loaves) or all the lettuces. Therefore they could not impose this on themselves as necessary. Secondly, and chiefly, because there was nothing alike in the lamb and the unleavened bread and lettuces; for the lamb was a thing of a certain determinate size. Therefore it could be said of it that it should all be eaten. —But lettuces and unleavened bread were not brought to a certain size; because no command had been imposed how much of unleavened bread or of lettuces they should take. So a rule could not be observed that they should eat all the unleavened bread or all the lettuces. Thirdly, the lamb belonged by itself to this ceremony; for blood was taken from the paschal lamb to sprinkle the doors of the houses... but nothing was taken

azymis (Deut. xvi.); scilicet "septem diebus comedes absque fermento "afflictionis panem, quemadmodum in pavore egressus es de Ægypto, " &c." Post exitum vero de Ægypto comedebantur agrestes lactucæ cum agno generaliter ad signandum quod factum fuerat in Ægypto, *i. e.* quia ibi comestæ sunt, postea quoque comederentur, &c. Sed dicet aliquis, An totæ lactucæ comedebantur sicut et totus agnus ut nihil de eo maneret, et si maneret cremaretur (Ex. xii.)? Dicendum quod duo adhibebantur ceremonialiter in esu agni; scilicet lactucæ agrestes et azyma, et tamen in his non observabatur quod in agno, scilicet quod totus agnus cremaretur. Primo quod circa cærimonialia non licebat Judæis aliquid adjungere quod positum non esset, et tamen Deus non imposuerat quod tota azyma aut totas lactucas comederent. Ergo non poterant ipsi sibi, velut necessarium, hoc imponere, Deut. xii. Secundo et præcipue quia non erat simile de agno et de azymis et lactucis; nam agnus erat res aliqua una determinatæ magnitudinis. Ideo poterat de illo dici quod totus comederetur. Lactucæ vero et azyma non fuerunt reducta ad certam magnitudinem, quia non impositum est quantum de azymis aut de lactucis sumerent. Ita non poterat ibi teneri regula quod tota azyma aut totas lactucas comederent. Tertio... Agnus pertinebat per se ad hanc cærimoniam ... nam de agno paschali sumebatur sanguis ad aspergendum portas domorum ... de lactucis vero et azymis nihil

from the lettuces and unleavened bread (for this purpose) but they were a kind of seasoning and adjunct, &c. Fourthly, because the lamb directly signified that Christ was to suffer: and that it was to be received by us in the way of a sacrament, &c. The whole lamb used to be made a sacred thing... lettuces and unleavened bread were not... We ought to be clean when we receive the eucharist and the unleavened bread of sincerity, &c. shews this."

I have given this concrete instance to shew what weight many of his arguments have; and to leave it to be imagined to what length his subdivisions will run when he is dealing with a more abstract subject in debate with Thomas Aquinas and Scotus, over both of whom he shews a certain superiority where I have traced him. But I must not venture on more than to give the title of Q. 119, Matt. xvii. Part IV. Vol. x. pt. 2, p. 421.

P. 421. "Whether two bodies can by miracle be in the same place together? That a body reduced to invisible atoms does not continue to be an organic body. How Christ is said to be in the "host"? What is the way in which the gift of subtleness (infinite fineness) operates? and what the bestowal of this subtle fineness is? And what it is that makes two bodies really distinct each from the other?...In what the miracle of two bodies being really in the same place consists? And what 'place' is? so that also one body cannot be in two places."

It is evident that these are very searching questions, which a man need be in the fifteenth century to dare to ask; and perhaps he almost needed to be as far away from the central authority of the West of Spain to dare to set down in writing intended for the public eye of scholars; for of course the founts of type and the printing-press were not yet.

---

sumebatur, sed erant quædam conditio et adjunctum, &c. Quarto quia agnus directe signabat Christum passurum et a nobis sumendum sacramentaliter, &c. Totus agnus efficiebatur res sacra ... lactucæ autem et azyma non erant ... Sumentes eucharistiam mundi esse debemus, quod signant azyma sinceritatis, &c.

*Part IV. Vol. X. Pt. II., p. 421.*

An duo corpora per miraculum possunt esse simul in eodem loco? Et quod corpus reductum ad indivisibilia non manet organicum [an answer to Leibnitz]. Et quomodo Christus dicatur esse in hostiâ. Et quæ sit operatio dotis subtilitatis: et quæ sit dos subtilitatis. Et quid faciat duo corpora esse realiter distincta. In quo consistat miraculum quod duo corpora sint in eodem loco. Et quid sit locus; quare item unum corpus non possit esse in duobus locis.

## (B.) GENNADIUS, PATRIARCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE. D. 1460.

He seems to have borne the name of George Scholarius at the ill-omened council which met at Ferrara and adjourned to Florence to bring about a re-union of the Eastern and Western Churches. He was not, like Bessarion, allured to desert the Eastern by brighter hopes in the Western: but he is thought to have held his Eastern views with great moderation in the Council of Florence, 1439. The one remarkable relic of his pen is a friendly debate on doctrine with Mahomet II. after he had taken the Eastern metropolis. It is interesting to extract a portion on the Lord's supper, and to follow it by an extract from the Confession of Faith by the Cyril Lucar favoured by our first Charles, and by other Eastern assemblies in council. All are printed together at Jena, by Ernest Julius Kimmel, under the title *Monumenta Fidei Ecclesiæ Orientalis*. These extracts supply a few ideas regarding the belief of the later English church.

Gennadius dwells very much on the illustrative character of the Word, as a title of the Son: but the only part which bears on our discussion is found in his first edition which exists in Latin; and it is to be observed that he does not hold to it in his second, which is a more careful edition of it, prepared for the Emperor Palæologus. The other great lights at Florence on the Greek side were Mark of Ephesus, and Dionysius of Sardis, besides Bessarion of Nicæa. Gennadius is said to have written an account of that council, which has perished. He was said to be first of all the patriarchs; and the title of *σοφώτατος* was assigned to him.

Cyril Lucar was Patriarch of Constantinople in 1621, and found great favour with our king Charles I. to whom he sent the famous MS. of the New Testament in the British Museum. He was deposed but restored; died 1638.

Dositheus is a name that we wonder to find given in the 15th century: but probably the parents did not know that it belonged in early times to the champion of Gnostic doctrine.

P. 7. "The Word of God was born of the Virgin Mary, as had been predicted by the mouths of the prophets. But yet He was then neither absent from the Father, nor from His own flesh, nor from all men, nor from the whole globe of earth; but He was everywhere and was diminished, but was filling all."

This is from Gennadius' Confession. The next is from Cyril Lucar's, who was patriarch of Constantinople in the 17th cent.

P. 36. "This is the simply true and genuine tradition of the wonderful mystery, in the taking which and serving of which we confess and believe the true and secure presence of our Lord Jesus Christ; but I mean that which our faith presents and introduces, not that which the vainly-invented transubstantiation teaches. Whence it is true that we eat and partake of and communicate in it if we believe: (but that) if we believe not we miss all the gain of the mystery, &c.... For the Lawgiver gave injunctions concerning His own body as well as concerning His own blood: a commandment which must not be curtailed according to every man's good pleasure: but the law handed down must be preserved in safety.

P. 103. "The fruits of this mystery are these. First, the remembrance of the sinless passion and death of Christ, 1 Cor. xi. The second gain, wherever it may happen to be: on account of

*Gennadii Confess. I. p. 7.*

Verbum Dei natum est ex Virgine Mariâ, ut ex prophetarum labiis fuerat prædictum. Attamen nec a Patre deficit, nec a carne, nec ab omnibus hominibus nec ab universo orbe: sed ubique erat, et non deminutum est, verum amplissimum erat.

*Cyrilli Luc. Conf. p. 36.*

Αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἀπλῶς ἀληθὴς καὶ γνησία τοῦ θαυμαστοῦ μυστηρίου παράδοσις, οὗτινος ἐν τῇ ἐγχειρίσει καὶ διακονίᾳ τὴν ἀληθὴ καὶ βεβαίαν παρουσίαν τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁμολογοῦμεν καὶ πιστεύομεν· πλὴν ἦν ἡ πίστις ἡμῶν παρίστωσι καὶ προσφέρει, οὐκ ἦν ἡ ἐφευρεθεῖσα εἰκὴ διδάσκει μετουσιῶσις, κ.τ.λ. "Ὅθεν ἀληθὲς ἐστὶν ἐσθίειν ἡμᾶς καὶ μετέχειν καὶ κοινωνοῦν εἶναι, ἐὰν πιστεύομεν· ἐὰν οὐ πιστεύομεν, παντὸς ἡμᾶς τοῦ μυστηρίου κέρδους ἀφίστασθαι, κ.τ.λ.... 'Ὁ γὰρ νομοθέτης, ὡς περὶ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ ἰδίου, οὕτω καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος ἐνετείλατο· ἦν ἐντολὴν οὐ δεῖ κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν ἐκάστω κολοβοῦσθαι ἀλλὰ σώαν τηρεῖσθαι τὴν νομοθετηθεῖσαν παράδοσιν.

*From Cyril Lucar's long Confession of the Eastern Church, in more modern Greek, p. 103.*

Οἱ καρποὶ τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου εἶναι τοῦτοι· πρῶτον ἡ ἀνάμνησις τοῦ ἀναμαρτήτου πάθους καὶ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ Χριστοῦ. 1 Cor. xi. 25. Τὸ δεύτερον κέρδος, ὅπου μὲν διδῆ εἶναι, διατὶ τὸ μυστήριον γίνεται ἱλασμός καὶ καλον

the mystery there is propitiation and a good understanding towards God with respect to our sins, whether we live or are dead, wherever there should be in it supplications and prayers to God on behalf of our sins. The third is an excellent (gain), wherever any kind of Christian is found coming frequently to this sacrifice and partaking of this mystery, he is liberated by it from every temptation and danger from the devil; because the enemy of the soul does not dare to hurt him at all, &c. Readiness for participating in the terrific mysteries, &c.”

*From the Decrees of the Syn. Const. 1672.*

P. 217. “The holy participation, in which being spiritually nourished, we both are together kept and grow, in the holy life according to the Spirit.”

*From Jer. Syn. agst. Calv.*

P. 388. “To those that hear indeed the Saviour say concerning the sacred working of the Divine mysteries handed down from Him, ‘Do this,’ &c., but do not rightly take up the remembrance... and make offering as a fancy and as a likeness in regard to it, making void the mystery of the terrific and Divine sacred working, through which we are receiving the pledge of the life to come. And this too when our divine father the golden speaker so clearly lays down the unchangeableness of the sacrifice, and repeats in many of the uttered teachings of the great Paul that it is one and the same. Thrice anathema!”

σύνημα πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν, εἴτε ζώντων εἴτε καὶ ἀποφθάνων, ὅπου νὰ μὴ γένοιεν εἰς αὐτὴν ἱκεσίαι καὶ δεήσεις πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἁμαρτημάτων· τὸ τρίτον διάφορον εἶναι, ὅπου ὅποιος Χριστιανὸς εὐρίσκεται παρὼν συχνὰ εἰς τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην, καὶ νὰ κοινωνᾷ τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου, ἐλευθερώνεται δι’ αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ κάθε πειρασμὸν καὶ κίνδυνον τοῦ διαβόλου· διατὶ δὲν ἀποτολμᾷ ὁ ἐχθρὸς τῆς ψυχῆς νὰ βλάψῃ ἐκείνον, κ.τ.λ. Ἡ ἐτοιμασία πρὸς τὴν μεταλήψιν τῶν φρικτῶν μυστηρίων, κ.τ.λ.

*Synod. Const. A.D. 1672, p. 217.*

Τὸ τῆς ἁγίας μεταλήψεως, ἐν ᾧ πνευματικῶς τρεφόμενοι συντηρούμεθα τε καὶ αὐξομεν ἐν τῇ κατὰ Πνεῦμα ζωῇ.

*Syn. Hierosol. adv. Calvinistas, 1672, p. 388.*

Τοῖς ἀκούουσι μὲν τοῦ Σωτῆρος περὶ τῆς παρ’ Αὐτοῦ παραδοθείσης τῶν θείων μυστηρίων ἱερουργίας λέγοντος Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, κ.τ.λ.· μὴ ἐκλαβομένοις δὲ ὀρθῶς τὴν ἀνάμνησιν...καὶ πρὸς ἐκείνην φανταστικῶς καὶ εἰκονικῶς ἀναφερομένοις, ὡς κενοῦσι τὸ τῆς φρικτῆς καὶ θείας ἱερουργίας μυστήριον, δι’ οὗ τὸν τῆς μελλούσης ζωῆς ἀρραβῶνα λαμβάνομεν· καὶ ταῦτα τοῦ θείου πατρὸς ἡμῶν τοῦ Χρυσοβήρμονος διατρανούντος τῆς θυσίας τὸ ἀπαράλλακτον, καὶ μίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν εἶναι φάσκοντος ἐν πολλαῖς τοῦ μεγάλου Παύλου ῥητῶν ἐξηγήσεων. Ἀνάθεμα τρίς.



*From Dositheus' Confession.*

P. 457. "We believe that the Lord Christ is present in the sacred working of this (sacrament) not in a typical way, nor after the manner of a likeness, nor (simply) with a grace transcending that in the other mysteries, nor by merely being present, as some of the fathers have said concerning baptism, nor by impanation, so that the Deity of the Word is made one hypostatically with bread set forth in the eucharist, as those on Luther's side very ignorantly and wretchedly conjecture, but truly and in fact, so that after the consecration of the bread and the wine the bread is changed, is transubstantiated, is made anew, is changed in the flow of its nature, into the very true body of our Lord, which was born of the ever-virgin in Bethlehem, &c.

*Dosithei Conf. p. 457.*

Τούτου ἐν τῇ ἱερουργίᾳ πιστεύομεν παρῆναι τὸν Κύριον Χριστὸν οὐ τυπικῶς οὐδ' εἰκονικῶς οὐδὲ χάριτι ὑπερβαλλούσῃ ὡς ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς μυστηρίοις οὐδὲ κατὰ μόνην παρουσίαν, καθὼς τινες τῶν πατέρων εἰρήκασιν περὶ τοῦ βαπτίσματος, οὐδὲ κατ' ἀναρισμὸν ὥστε ἐνοῦσθαι τὴν Θεότητα τοῦ Λόγου τῷ προκειμένῳ τῆς εὐχαριστίας ἄρτῳ ὑποστατικῶς καθὼς οἱ ἀπὸ Λουθήρου λίαν ἀμαθῶς καὶ ἀθλίως δοξάζουσιν, ἀλλ' ἀληθῶς καὶ πραγματικῶς, ὥστε μετὰ τὸν ἁγιασμὸν τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ τοῦ οἴνου μεταβάλλεσθαι, μετουσιοῦσθαι, μεταποιεῖσθαι, μεταρρυθμίζεσθαι τὸν μὲν ἄρτον εἰς αὐτὸ τὸ ἀληθές τοῦ Κυρίου σῶμα ὅπερ ἐγεννήθη ἐν Βηθλεὲμ ἐκ τῆς ἀειπαρθένου, κ.τ.λ.

(C.) PROF. ULLMANN'S "REFORMERS BEFORE THE REFORMATION."  
1400.

I insert my extracts from this writer in this place, as he is to my mind the best interpreter of the German Reformation movement, viewed philosophically, which is the real central path of that part of history, shewing not so much the actual form of events that happened, from which we have to infer the general principles of the movement, but rather the changed general principles themselves embodied in that great movement: but I should be guilty of utter surplusage if I took upon me further to explain Professor Ullmann's explanation.

P. 1. "In undertaking to give an account of several remarkable persons, who in the 15th century paved the way for the Reformation, we have first of all to explain what the Reformation really was....Nothing is more common—and the remark applies to the friends no less than to the enemies of the Reformation—

than to conceive of that event as something essentially *negative*, a mere setting aside of errors and abuses, &c. A Reformation in the higher sense of the word is always a great historical result, the issue of a spiritual process extending through centuries. It is a widely felt and overpowering necessity...essentially based on a large and comprehensive public spirit such as...forms itself slowly and gradually by an inward and irresistible agency...no mere negative hostility to existing things is powerful enough to unite the minds of men on a large scale, and to keep them for centuries in a state of tension and movement....Such a seed too is always positive. It first secures a position for itself, and then, in order to make room for its free development, it opposes what is foreign and repels what is obstructive...Reformation means formation again, restoration of life....[P. 3.] There are three things indispensably necessary. Corruption must really exist in the domain where it is to take place: the necessity of abolishing that corruption must be felt and recognized; and the rudiments must be prepared of a new and better system to be substituted for the old...only at such a time and not at any optional point of history can *true reformers* make their appearance: because under no other circumstances can they be thoroughly successful. [P. 5.] With respect to the government, by confounding Old and New Testament principles, *the primitive idea* of the universal spiritual priesthood of Christians was [had been] supplanted by the notion of a special order of priests....The simple heart-affecting rites ... of the early Christians had given way to that form of the Lord's supper *which treats it as a constantly renewed sacrifice* of the God-man, present *alike in spirit and in body*. [P. 6.] The conversion of the Gospel of grace into a doctrine of salvation by outward acts....It [had] engendered a multitude of evils: such as the notion of the desert of good works, the doctrine of a treasure of merits, the whole system of indulgences, the various corruptions of Monachism, and in general the mistaken conception of Christianity as a mere preceptive institute, &c. The rise in the Church of a separate priestly order, reckoned of itself holy and divine, (had) produced inwardly a total change in the spiritual relation of Christians towards God and the Saviour, &c. In fine the idea of a sacrifice in the holy supper became the central point of that mysterious and splendid ritual, &c., which soon degenerated into an empty form, extruding the worship of the spirit and the heart, and completely forcing into the shade the doctrine of salvation so essential to Christianity. [P. 10.] The principle that salvation flows not from man but from God may be considered as the ultimate and comprehensive basis of the Reformation, and the main tendency in which all the reformers are comprised concentrates itself in the endeavour to prostrate human things (however venerable by tradition or high in the estimation of the Church) before God and Christ—to give the glory to Them alone—to separate from Chris-

tian faith and practice whatever seems derogatory to the Divine honour and word, and to restore the proper relationship of man and the church towards God—a relationship either immediate, or formed by [through] Christ the sole and everlasting priest...First the necessity of appealing to Scripture as the pure word of God in opposition to all human doctrine and tradition, &c., and secondly the conviction...that perfect peace and full salvation do not spring from human actions or ecclesiastical works at all, but solely from the grace of God revealed by Jesus Christ and embraced by living and true faith—and that the shortest and only safe way to God is not the church and the church's ordinances....but Christ the Saviour and Redeemer, and His Spirit, Who alone can make men free and guide them to all truth and holiness. Such were the radical truths.

Preface, p. xiv. "The Reformation viewed in its most general character is the reaction of Christianity, as gospel, against Christianity as law. During the mediæval ages the essential nature of the Christian faith became gradually and progressively misunderstood, until at last it was reduced almost wholly to an objective law [*i.e.* regarding merely resulting acts], an external ordinance strict and unbending, &c. Evolving the vital spirit from the word of Scripture, more purely and strictly interpreted, it taught men once more to recognize in Christianity a creative power of God, diffusing fresh life into the roots of our spiritual being, and guiding us from the atonement to sanctification—a free doctrine of grace and faith, of love and spirit, prompting us from the heart to the fulfilment of the law, while at the same time it restored the doctrine which is the kernel of St Paul's creed, but which in the course of time had been wholly overgrown by the legalism which had crept in. The extent to which this constitutes the germ of the Reformation can scarcely be conceived by any other means than an acquaintance with the spiritual manifestations which preceded it. Its forerunners were almost more than its agents under the dominion of a Christianity petrified into law—a sort of legal ecclesiasticism....With this fundamental antagonism between law and gospel...there is that [wide difference] between the externalism and the internalism of the religious and moral life. On the legal standpoint religious and moral things are predominantly conceived and rated, as quantities—upon the evangelical as qualities. In the one case stress is laid on the visible act—upon the character, number and extent of the works performed—in short upon what may be weighed and measured in the spiritual life. In the other it is laid upon what is inmost in the general bias of the mind—upon such imponderable things as faith and sentiment. In the one case the language is, 'Be right and fulfil all the commandments.' In the other, 'Believe and love out of a pure heart and *then* do what

'you will and must, for all that comes from unfeigned faith and 'love is good.' This antithesis—which is also one of the radical differences between the old and new covenant—runs, no less than that between law and gospel, through the whole of church history. Besides being legalized, the mediæval church had more or less fallen a prey to the principle of externalism. In opposition to this, however, *mysticism*—thus also becoming an important preparatory element of the Reformation—*asserted the principle of internalism*. This it not unfrequently did in a sound and vigorous way and with great success, but sometimes also with a partial and morbid spiritualism, which by falsely severing the outward from the inward, laid the whole strain upon the latter, and by this means sank into pure indifference regarding moral actions, and wholly lost sight of the necessity of imbuing with Christian principle everything that belongs to life. The true pioneers of the Reformation occupy the sounder standing, &c., &c. They require no self-sequestration inwards or monkish retreat from the world, but a vigorous infusion of the Christian spirit into all the relations of life. How far it belonged to the essence is most evident from the recognition of its importance in all the preparatory rudiments. It is the centre of the controversy waged by its precursors against works of righteousness, merit and supererogation, against indulgence—the opus operatum—monachism—vows, and everything of the sort. [P. xvi.] Next in importance is the principle of Christian liberty...The soil in which their notion of liberty was rooted is the Christian doctrine of grace and faith. True liberty flows from fellowship with God, &c. The complete exemption from all outward restraint and arbitrary factitious ordinances and authority, &c., perfectly consistent with inward subjection to the Divine ordinances, and to the laws of Divine truth and charity. As they knew of no Christianity but that which is itself free, so do they also know no other liberty than that which is christian and evangelical, and the offspring of vital faith and love.

P. 12. *General introduction*. "The Reformers unite the thetical with the antithetical. This feature is likewise conspicuous in their true precursors. Some labour more to establish positive truth [John of Goch]; some rather to refute error [John of Wesel]. In John Wessel we behold a portrait of the accomplished theologian of the age prior to the Reformation. If to these we add the brethren of the common lot we shall likewise have the share contributed by the people on the one hand and by the *practical mystics* on the other, in paving the way for the improvement of the church."

These long extracts seem to be of the utmost value as accounting for and elucidating the great change that exhibits itself

in the gradual clearing that had place in the predominant views on the Lord's supper when once the Reformation had fairly laid hold of considerable portions of Christendom. Perhaps it would be ungrateful in me to complain of the length of the statement of the Professor's views, when the testimony of the sense of their value is marked by the assignment of so much space. Our extracts now again become the utterances of individual divines of the period itself.

P. 135. "John of Goch, priest at Mechlin, asserted *Ecclesiam posse errare*: and from that [point] contested many doctrines and articles—ecclesiastical vows and obligations—belief in the efficacy of the sacraments *ex opere operato*, distinction of priests and bishops as of Divine appointment, and the prevailing opinion on evangelical poverty. [P. 138.] C. Grapheus (Schreiber). We have declined from Christ to Moses and have backslidden from Moses to Pharaoh—the flesh-pots of Egypt and the bondage of the brickkilns—from Christ to Moses, from the gospel to the Jewish law. [P. 203.] Gregory of Heimbürg, counsellor of the princes convoked at Mantua by Pius II. The apostles are supposed to have acknowledged Peter for their chief, and to have raised him to the chair at Antioch...The place of the apostles is now taken by general councils. [P. 264.] When his opponents urged against him Peter Lombard's definition that a sacrament is the visible form of invisible grace, and yet, as involving its cause, is more than an image of it, J. Wesel on the contrary took his stand on the simple definition of Augustine, that it is just the visible form of invisible grace. The truth seemed to him, that when the priest with right intention and suitable words dispenses the sacrament of penitence to a person in a penitent state of mind, God Himself works, produces, carries into effect the pardon of sin. [P. 270.] Wesel considers the relation of the sinner to God as in its inmost core *direct*. The church to mediate, but *can give nothing to the sinner*, which has not already and directly been given. Their function not to judge and decide, but to preach and serve. The gifts of His mercy always proceed in a sovereign way from God Himself. [Pp. 296 and 350.] The body of Christ might exist under the form of bread though the substance of the bread remained.

Vol. II. p. 258. "The theology of the Reformers was not mysticism. The theology of the Reformers, especially Luther and Zwingel, possessed an element of science and erudition, of which that of the mystics was wholly destitute. We have to contemplate [among the Reformers before the Reformation] a man who, reared in a mystical school, grew up with a freedom and solidity of

scientific spirit, which well entitles him to be called the theological forerunner of the Reformation. We speak of John Wessel. [P. 382.] At the death of Gerson, Wessel was in the tenth year of his age. When Wessel died, Luther was a boy of six, Zwingel of five, and Melanchthon unborn; Erasmus twenty-two and Reuchlin thirty-four. [P. 390.] During the whole of the middle ages the practical, sentimental, poetical and intuitive theology of the mystics arose as a necessary antithesis to the narrow theoretic leading of the schoolmen. [P. 393.] In the 15th century we find its greatest theologian pointing to...a vital Scriptural theology. Almost all the theologians of the period are penetrated more or less with a consciousness of it. In contradistinction to scholastics and strict dogmatists Bible-theologians are reared in greater numbers. During the twelfth and thirteenth centuries only the former were held in high estimation and exercised great public influence. An expositor of Scripture was a very subordinate person, and it behoved him to retire before a sententiary and a summist. Now the opinion changed. [P. 501.] The efficiency and fruit of the sacraments depend not merely on the intention of the party who administers them, but upon the participant's frame of mind....He who believes feeds on the body of Christ, even though it be nowhere externally offered to him. Of this Paul the hermit was a proof, who lived for so many years in the desert, and who, unless he had eaten the flesh of the Son of Man and drunk His blood, would have had no life in him. When it is said that a mass celebrated for many is less efficacious for any one of the number than it would be if celebrated for that one (only), I reckon this to be false. It is efficacious for every one as far as he is spiritually changed and amended by it, not as far as the celebrant desires....The merit of him who celebrates a mass or offers a prayer does not always operate, as we clearly see in the prayers that are [have been] offered that the popes may lead an exemplary life; for here the intercession of the most pious men avails nothing, because the repugnant inclinations of popes themselves prevent [have prevented]. [P. 521.] [From the treatise of Honius.] Even granting that Christ in instituting the Lord's supper really had transmuted the bread or combined it with His body...it does not follow that every priest can do the same. The words 'Do this in remembrance of Me,' invest priests with no such power. The doctrine of transubstantiation would be a very important article; but not a word of it is said in what we call the Apostles' Creed. It is to be found only in the decretals. And this very circumstance strengthens the suspicion that it is a papal invention, and all the more when we reflect that it serves as a basement to the whole of the papal religion....Satan, to turn all things upside down, has persuaded men of a bodily presence, not in the human form, yet in the form of bread. Take

transubstantiation away, and the whole religion of the pope falls to pieces. And that it will one day fall who can doubt, seeing that so considerable a part of it is already overthrown? [P. 531.] The body and blood of the Lord, however sacred, are still corporeal substances and not spirit. Hence, if they are taken only in a corporeal manner, they not merely do not spiritually invigorate the eater, but they cause his death, 1 Cor. xi. and John vi. It is the Spirit that quickeneth, and this means that however sacred the flesh may be it has little to do in the case.... It is not as if the flesh and blood did not contribute to the justification of the communicant, for whosoever with faith unfeigned and in reliance on the Divine omnipotence believes that under the species of Jesus (and as the consequence of God's high esteem, condescending beneficence and salutary operation) the holy flesh and holy blood *are really present* and contained [this is just palpable and peculiar Lutheranism] will doubtless experience in himself some stirrings of spiritual life, unless he believes and eats with a cold heart—eats, if it may be so called, with no consideration or discernment or inward digestion and taste—eats but only in a corporally carnal and not in a spiritual manner. Hence neither is he spiritually quickened; for such a faith as this can enliven no one in holiness and righteousness. Whosoever then eats and drinks the spiritual sacrament only with his teeth and mouth does not eat at all, unless the inner man live to God; John vi. 'If any man eat this 'bread he shall live for ever,' &c., &c. Whosoever therefore visibly eats, unless he eats spiritually, properly does not eat at all. Accordingly the flesh, if consumed in a mere fleshly way, brings no salvation: but if understood spiritually, and in the spirit of love, offered, accepted, contemplated and enjoyed, *it* is life-giving, and a fountain of salvation. [Thus do the opinions of the fourth century come up again in the nineteenth. Christ did not say, The flesh profiteth the unbeliever nothing: but absolutely, The flesh (*i.e.* itself) profiteth nothing (to any one).] It can be so however only for him, who already lives, and longs for the nourishment; and consequently the essential function of the body and blood of Christ in the supper belongs only to him who feels the inward want, and has the proper susceptibility for it. [P. 529.] It is not the flesh of Christ that justifies—not the blood; but the work, that *is conveyed to us* by the flesh and blood. If all arts, all works of science, of counsel, of courage, of wisdom, of faithfulness, and benevolence, have their root and seminary *in meditation and remembrance*, and if they are perfected and cherished by *meditation*, and grow and advance *by it* to their perfection, who will deny that this holy and blessed *memorial*, instituted for all who fear the Lord, to keep in remembrance His wonderful works, is efficacious for every end for which God has sent His Word?

[P. 528.] "Christ is Himself truly present, not merely by

His Divinity and goodness but even *bodily* [That we do not admit]—by the whole *beneficial efficacy* of the power, skill and fulness which *are given* to His flesh and blood...He is Himself *bodily present* in the celebrant, as the celebrant in Him." [The collection of opinions would have been incomplete without a half-modern German doctor of what is now the Lutheran persuasion. To all such we humbly address the entire work in its three parts.]

(D.) ÆNEAS SYLVIVS, PIUS II. B. 1405. D. 1464.

It is a great saying of Milton "that the mind of one that is to become a great poet must itself be a good poem, it must be "filled with all noble sentiments." Akin to this would be the assertion that for a work of imagination to reach the highest moral excellence, its subject should be a man of very noble mind. But for this I can hardly conceive of a richer subject for a work of fiction than the life of Æneas Sylvius. There is first his visit in early life to this island, the northern part in particular, then scarce further advanced from mere barbarism than England in the days of Alfred; then the appearance of Sylvius at the critical manœuvres of the reforming party at the Council of Constance; then his turning and rising to be the Pope's Secretary with almost the "Ego et rex meus" of Wolsey; and lastly, the various scenes that in succession crowd the canvas when he becomes Pius II. in that eventful age. He moves between Naples and Germany, Bessarion and Callistus, the Pope and the Emperor, the one indispensable man to all, till all agree to have him, first, Cardinal, then universal father of Western Christendom. Henceforward he drops everything but the church's interests, as then understood; he honourably frees himself from his duty to the Emperor of Germany, stands up against France and her liberties involved in the Pragmatic Sanction, thinks nothing of placing himself at the antipodes of the opinions which he advocated at Constance; subordinates everything to the rousing of Christendom against the Turks, and exceeding all others in zeal and courage expires in the glory of a certain kind of martyrdom for that sacred cause off the town of Ragusa. What a theme for the pencil of a real poet, the one counter-consideration first hinted being excepted. A good deal of audacious and adroit



versatility may be traced in his four reasons for withholding the cup from the laity. Well may it be said, that few of more consummate ability ever sat in the so-called chair of St Peter.

C. 35. "Peter of Diessen in Bavaria...that you should look to this Jacobel of St Michael's with wonder as a learned and holy man, &c., that you have not observed that error of his in the mode of communion in the eucharist, which long ago had injured the church. For he ministers the Lord's body to the people under one kind, when in St John it is ordered to be received in the two kinds of bread and wine, John vi. 'Unless ye eat, &c., and drink, &c.' Jacobel stirred up by these words, having scrutinized the ancient MSS. of the holy doctors, particularly those of Dionysius and Cyprian, after he had found the communion commended (or quoted) in them, began publicly to admonish the people, never afterwards to neglect the communion of the cup. To him all the heretics agreed in no moderate degree, making joyful demonstrations, &c. (2) Sigismund (the emperor) held a council at Iglau and approved it, with this additional condition that they should publicly instruct the people between the times of communion that Christ is not contained under the form of bread nor under the form of wine alone, but that the whole and entire Christ is contained under quality and form.

P. 671. *Letter.* "I am going to answer to you nothing of my own but (only) what the holy doctors under the Divine breath of the Spirit deliver to us [nothing like a man who has

*Historia Bohemica, Pars II. c. XXXV. Basilee.*

Petrus (Diesensis) hunc Jacobelum apud eccl. de S. Michaelis, mirari te, ut doctum et sanctum virum, &c., errorem istum non advertisse communionis eucharistiæ, qui jampridem ecclesiam pessundasset, in quâ sub unâ specie Dominicum corpus populo ministrat, cum apud Johannem... sub duplici specie panis vinique sumi jubeatur, John vi. "Nisi, &c." Commotus his Jacobelus verbis, perquisitis vetustis sanctorum doctorum codicibus, Dionysii præsertim et Cypriani, (postquam) communionem in illos laudatam invenisset, publice commonere populum cœpit, ne deinceps communionem calicis negligerent. Huic omnes hæretici consentierunt haud modice gestientes lætitiâ, &c. (2) Sigismundus, concilio Iglaiæ habito, comprobavit, &c. eâ conditione adjunctâ, ut inter communicandum plebem publice instruant non sub specie panis Christum nec sub specie vini solum sanguinem sed sub qualitate et specie totum et integrum contineri Christum.

*Pontif. Epist. Lib. I. p. 671. 25.*

Responsurus tibi nil de meo sed quod sancti doctores Divino afflatu Spiritus tradunt et quod docet ecclesia tradam. Nam Sibi assistit Christus et suggerit omnia Spiritus sanctus. Cujus maxima dignitas

changed sides for a strong statement !], and I will deliver what the church teaches. For Christ stands by Himself (*i.e.* the church and the Holy Spirit suggests all things; to whom belong the highest dignity, the summit of power and immeasurable authority, which neither deceives nor is deceived. And if any one should despise His teaching let him be reckoned as a heathen and a publican. A man cannot now have God as a father who has not the church as a mother. The sense of truth is to be received from the Scripture itself, which the church alone knows and expounds to her own sons... You have accused the Roman church that in denying the cup of communion to the people she shuts the gate against the Gospel (and) denies Christ. There are then four things that (ought to) move not thee only but all whom the opinion, not to say the madness of the Hussites has separated from the Roman church. (1) In the first place, in St John's Gospel it is not a drinking in the form of the sacred sign that is there enjoined but a spiritual one that is insinuated. [Very adroit, because true just so far as he goes.] (2) If anyone follow Wycliff and Rochezan he sets darkness before light, a lie before the truth. Let us pass to the other evangelists... The words which you have quoted were not spoken to all the faithful, but to the apostles alone, who... were either already priests or then received the priesthood. The words 'as often as ye shall 'drink,' is 'when ye shall *make*' (Christ's body) [Jerome's term again] when ye offer sacrifices, (terms) which are only suitable to use about priests. 'Do this' is 'make this sacrifice.' Had Christ in these words enjoined the communion of the cup on laymen also, it would have been revealed not to the Bohemians

---

est, summa potentia, immensurabilis auctoritas, quæ neque fallit neque fallitur. Quam si quis docentem contempserit, ut ethnicus et publicanus habendus sit... Habere jam non potest Deum Patrem qui non habeat ecclesiam matrem... Ab ipsâ Scripturâ recipiendus est sensus veritatis, quam sola novit et suis filiis exponit ecclesia... Accusasti Romanam ecclesiam quæ cum communionis calicem plebi denegat, evangelium ostiat, Christum negat. Quatuor sunt ideo quæ non te solum sed omnes movent, quos Hussitarum opinio, ne dicam rabies, ab ecclesiâ Romanâ sejunxit. (1) Imprimis in evangelio Johannis non bibitio sacramentalis illic præcipitur sed spiritualis insinuat. (2)... Siquis Wycliff Rochezanumque sequitur, luci tenebras, veritati mendacium, præfert... Ad reliquos evangelistas transeamus... Verba quæ retulisti non omnibus fidelibus sed apostolis solum dicta fuerunt, qui... aut jam sacerdotes, aut tunc sacerdotium acceperint. "Quotiescunque biberitis," est "quando conficietis," quando sacrificium offertis, quod solis sacerdotibus convenit. "Hoc facite" est "hoc sacrificium conficite." Si Christus his verbis communionem calicis etiam laicis imperasset, non solum Bohemis, sed aliis gentibus revelatum esset: sed nulla schola hoc sentit, nulla civitas probat, nulla extra

alone, but to all nations [a most unsound argument unless to those that believe that the whole church can err *in nothing*]: but no school perceives, no city (state) approves it, no church outside Bohemia holds out. [In all this pleading one is reminded of Southey's saying in the legend of St James of Compostella... 'Thou shouldest have been a lawyer.' At common pleas it would be excellent. He takes each plea just so far as it goes with him, and then seems not to have eyes for further inferences.] (3) That the figure of the old law might be fully accomplished, He reserves the wine for libations for the priests alone. (4) It is the custom of the Roman church. Greece (once at the head) has grown old, and grown cold. She has been put under tribute, that was the mistress of foreign peoples. She is now a disciple of the Latins."

---

Bohemiam ecclesia tenet. (3) Ut impleretur figura veteris legis, libamina solis sacerdotibus reservat; and (4) It is the custom of the Roman church, Græcia consenuit, frigida est. Facta est sub tributo quæ fuit alienorum magistra, nunc est discipula Latinorum.

(E.) WILLIAM TYNDALL. B. 1477. D. 1535.

Some actions are immortal, and so are some words. The world as long as it may last will never cease to be quickened at their utterance. The man, from whose lips they came, may have proved partly or entirely unfaithful to them, but for all that the pulse of the hearers' blood cannot but move faster when they are read or spoken. Such an one is the saying of Tyndall, which has been preserved to us by Fox. A learned divine once said to Tyndall, "We were better without God's laws than without the pope's." Tyndall fired at the saying. He replied: "I defy the pope and all his laws. If God spare my life, ere many years I will cause that a boy that driveth the plough shall know more of the Scripture than thou doest." This saying was Tyndall's life in microcosm. He was then in the most dependent of positions, a chaplain in a baronet's house, liable to be dismissed at any time, if he did not please him and yet more his lady. But he passed from that house of Little Sodbury to Bishop Tunstal, in London, with a translation of an oration of Isocrates in hand, done to prove that he could translate the Greek Testament. Rejected by the well-born prelate he flies to Germany, and nothing stops him but a prison

and death; and *that* does not come until he has found for all the New Testament and a great part of the Old the words of simple power, nine-tenths of which are still on the lips of the powerful English-speaking nations and tribes that are doing the greater part of the missionary work that is done in the world. The one key to which all the heroic music of his life was set, was this fixed purpose, framed at Sodbury in defiance of Dr Parker and his fellow-combatants against the truth, viz. that the lowest classes in England should have God's scripture. It was from the anvil of Erasmus that this spark originally came. Erasmus could not resolve on leaving the Romish communion himself. He died in it: but the following words of that eminent Reformer sound like a lovely variation of Tyndall's simpler air. "The mysteries of kings it were better perhaps to conceal; but "Christ wishes His mysteries to be published as widely as possible. I would wish even all women to read the Gospel (*i.e.* "the four Gospels) and the Epistles of St Paul. And I wish "they were translated into all languages of the people that "they might be read and known not merely by the Scotch and "Irish, but even by the Turks and the Heathens." Then the music begins; "I wish that the husbandman may sing parts "of them at his plough, that the weaver may warble them at "his shuttle, that the traveller may with their narratives beguile "the weariness of the way." No Greek chorus, no lyric of Pindar, or Milton or Dryden, or Pope or Collins or Wordsworth, is superior to this. Its topic is so lofty, and its words are essentially musical, the music of a northern free language learned amidst brooks and willows. It is impossible not to admire the perseverance of Warren Hastings, who formed as a boy at the village school of Daylesford the to him gigantic project of purchasing the Manor, and who lived to settle there and at death to leave his devoted and heroic widow, whom I knew, in possession of it. But that was earthly though fair ambition. The purpose and the perseverance of William Tyndall are akin to the imagined hymns and harmonies of heaven. These hopes ever cast Divine light on his o'erlaboured eyes, even when under the cruel dominion of the emperor Charles amid the burning flame in the castle of Vilvorde they looked their last on a sin-stricken struggling world and their first on the high and happy rest that remains for the people of God.

It is perhaps natural rather than singular that Tyndall stands out, as one of the few whose language on the Lord's supper seems to be in complete accord with the Scriptures. The marvel perhaps is that any are co-equals with him. If Tyndall's monument on the Coteswold Hills, near Nibley, wanted a Latin motto, he well merited, not by the end of his career only, but ever on from its very beginning to its close, the three grand words in the fourth Satire of Juvenal,

"vitam impendere vero."

Yes :

ut libera posset  
verba Dei proferre et vitam impendere vero.

Tyndall as much gives you the impression of a man sent of God expressly to do a particular work of inexpressible value, as Moses or Paul.

*Doctrinal Discourses.* Parker Society.

P. 426. "If a man say of the sacrament of Christ's body and blood, that it is a sacrifice as well for the quick as the dead... then is Christ's body there slain, and His blood there shed : but that is not so. And therefore it is properly no sacrifice, but a sacrament and a memorial of that everlasting sacrifice once for all, &c. It preacheth unto them that are alive only... But under *the pretence of soul health* it is a servant unto our spirituality's holy covetousness, and an extortioner, and a builder of abbeys, colleges, chauntries and cathedral churches.

P. 300. *The sacraments.* "Seeing then that man is so sick, so prone and ready to fall, and so cruelly invaded (when he hath sinned) of the fiend the flesh and the law, that he is oft put to flight and feared and made to run away from his Father, therefore hath the God of all mercy and affectionate pity and boundless compassion set up this sacrament *as a sign on a high hill*, whence it may be seen on every side, far or near [Who can fail to think with pleasure of Tyndale's own monument ?], to call again them that be fled and run away...to gather them under the wings of His mercy : and hath commanded His sacrament to be had in continual use to put them in mind of mercy laid up for them in Christ's blood, and to witness and to testify to them and to be the seal thereof. For the sacrament doth much more vehemently *print lively* the faith and make it sink down into the heart than bare words only, &c.

P. 362. "Natural reason ought to teach us that the outward corporeal and bodily thing cannot help the spiritual soul.

P. 366. "The unquiet scrupulous superstitious nature of man, wholly given to idolatry, hath stirred up such traditions, about this one sacrament most especially. One part (the Romanists) say that these words, 'This is My body,' compel us to believe under pain of damnation that the bread and wine are changed into the very body and blood of Christ, *really*, as the water in Galilee was turned into *very* wine. The second part (the Lutherans) say, We are not bound to believe that bread and wine are changed; but only that His body and blood *are there presently*. The third sort say that the words, 'This is My body,' &c., were true as Christ meant them, and as the people of that country to whom Christ spake were accustomed to understand such words, and that the Scripture, &c....as Jacob called the place Peniel (Gen. xxxii.) *i.e.* God's face ... It is true to say of the field that it was God's face though it be not His *very face* (many other instances pp. 376—8). [P. 369.] When Christ said 'Ye eat the flesh, &c. ye have no life in you,' this cannot be understood of the sacrament, for Abraham had life and all the holy fathers. Christ's mother, Elizabeth, Zacharias, John the Baptist, Simeon, Anna, and all the holy fathers had life already by faith in Christ; of which not one had eaten His flesh and drunken His blood with their bodily mouths. Ergo, to believe and trust in Christ's blood was the eating there meant... The two first parties taking the old doctors to be on their side, I answer, many of the old doctors spoke so mystically that they seem sometimes to *affirm plainly* that it is but bread and wine only concerning the substance; and sometimes *that it is very body and blood*... And unto one of the *second* opinion that the bread is His very body I answer, Ye must remember that the old doctors as earnestly call it a *sacrifice* as Christ's body. But that *ye deny*... Christ dieth no more, and therefore is no more sacrificed ... The priests in God's stead proffer Him and give Him unto the people for a remission and absolution of their sins daily, if they by the moving and stirring of the sacrament believe in the body and blood of Christ. Wherefore ye ought of no right to be angry with those of the *third* opinion, *though they deny the doctors*, where they seem to say that the sacrament is the very body of Christ; nevertheless they answer that the doctors call it a sacrifice only because it is the memorial, &c.... Neither the sacrifices of the old law, which prophesied the sacrificing of Christ, neither yet our redemption was fulfilled *that night*. For if the scriptures and the prophecies were then fulfilled [*i.e.* at the institution of the supper] and we then redeemed, Christ died *on the morrow* in vain... The sacrament was no doubt but a *description of His passion to come*, as it is now a memorial

of His passion past... Neither can it be proved less repugnant that a creature should be everywhere than that he should be God.

III. p. 171. *Answer to Sir Thos. More's dialogue.* "I look not on bread and wine, but on the body of Christ broken and His blood spilled for our sins.

I. 372. "As when a man seeketh for a text sometime in the Bible, he seeth paper and ink and the figures of letters, yet his heart not once thinketh of any other thing than the words and sense of the text. The part after these words once spoken, (he) thinketh only of the covenant made in the body and blood of Christ, and *through faith* eateth His body and drinketh His blood, though his eyes and other senses perceive nothing but bread and wine.

III. 179. "If they [other persons] be absent, the sacrament *profiteth them as much* as a sermon made in a church profiteth them that be in the fields. And how it profiteth the souls of the dead—tell me—to whom it is no sign."

*Works of Tyndale, Barnes and Frith.* 3 Vols. London, 1831.

Vol. III. 24. [This should be connected with the extracts from Frith, as it is a defence of Frith, called as by More, "this "young man," being then reckoned 24, but by his parents 30 years of age. Tyndall's writing will be found *quite free* from those imperfections into which Frith fell. This is noteworthy.] "It is I that am this lively bread, which am come from Heaven, of Whom whoso eat by faith shall never die. Here therefore it is to be noted diligently, that Christ meaneth, as every man may see, by the eating of this bread *none other thing* than the belief of Himself: offered up for our sins, &c. &c. [not one word about eating 'His true body indeed in the soul,' as Frith, good as he is, says]. Thus now may ye see how Christ's flesh, which He called bread, is the spiritual food and meat of our souls, *when our souls by faith see*, &c. &c., then have we eaten His flesh and drunk His blood, assured firmly of the favour of God. [P. 25.] Yet were the carnal Jews never the wiser: for their belief and sturdy hatred would not suffer the very spiritual sense and mind of Christ's words to enter into their hearts... They stuck fast in His flesh before their eyes, those fleshy Jews. [P. 26.] We eat and drink it indeed, when we believe stedfastly that He died for the remission of our sins—Austin and Tertullian to witness. [P. 28.] After this text thus proved to be understood [by More] in the literal sense with carnal Jews and not in the allegorical or spiritual sense with Christ and His apostles, the whole sum of More's confutation of 'the young man' standeth upon this argument. A posse ad esse. That is to wit, God

may do it; ergo it is done. Christ may make His body in many or in all places at once, ergo it is in many or in all places at once, &c. &c. M. More must first prove it by express words of Holy Scripture and not by his own unwritten dreams, &c. Wherefore More would so fain make thee believe that the apostles left out certain things unwritten, of necessity to be believed, even to establish the pope's kingdom, which standeth of More's unwritten vanities, &c. If ye will believe whatever More can feign without the Scripture, then can this poet feign you another church than Christ's, and that ye must believe it whatever it teacheth you, for he hath feigned to that it cannot err, though ye see it err and fight against itself a thousand times. Yea if it tell you black is white, good is bad, &c., ye must believe it, or else be burned as heretics. [P. 32.] Word hath he none for him in all Scripture. [P. 33.] I know the voice of my Herdsman: Which, if He said in any place of Scripture that His body should have been contained under the form of bread and [in] so many places at once here in earth and also abiding yet still in Heaven too, verily I should have believed Him as soon and as firmly as M. More. And therefore even yet, if he can shew us but one sentence truly taken for his part, as we can do many for the contrary, we must give place."

It is worthy of note that Tyndall is willing to hang all on but one single passage of God's word "truly taken:" but his noble young disciple Frith is rash enough to stake all on More's finding one single passage of some six or seven chief fathers, some of them containing eleven and thirteen volumes in relation to two main points of his true challenge.

There is a passage of More in which to facilitate faith in the multiplications of Christ's body now on earth he refers to the innumerable images in two mirrors set opposite and the like. Tyndall answers,

P. 83. "I ask More, when he seeth his own face in so many glasses, whether all those faces that appear in the glasses, be his own very faces, having bodily substance, skin, flesh and bone, as hath that face which has very mouth, nose, eyes, &c. If they be all his very faces, then in very deed there is one body in many places, and he himself beareth as many faces in one body... The bread broken and eaten in the supper nourisheth and putteth us in remembrance, &c. We eat His body, &c. i.e., we surely believe that His body was crucified for our sins and His blood shed for our salvation."



If any one shrink from summing up the whole personal fruits of the Lord's supper as "belief" or "faith," I would pray him to enlarge his idea of faith. For saving faith is so far from being mere acceptance of a doctrine by the understanding, that it implies the affections being moved by it and the whole principles of action being set in motion; in a word, as faith includes all religion, so if the Lord's supper increase faith and its activity in all good things, there is no personal spiritual benefit that is not comprehended in this term "belief" in that death of Christ and in all its consequences which the receiving of this sacrament signifies and sets forth. Tyndall and many other eminent writers have therefore resolved all difficulties into this axiom, To eat is to believe, *Edere est credere*.

P. 47. "Neither let it offend thee... that 'est' is taken for 'significat'... For this is a common manner of speech in many places of Scripture — and also in our mother tongue, as when we see many pictures or images, which we know well are but signs to represent the bodies whom they be made like; yet we say of the image of our Lady, This is our Lady; and of St Katherine, This is St Katherine; and yet do they but represent and signify our Lady or St Katherine, &c. &c. The three baskets are three days, &c. &c. Marvel not therefore though 'est' likewise in this sentence, *Hoc est corpus Meum*, be taken for 'significat,' as much as to say, This signifieth body. See Ezekiel v., a third part of the hairs, 'This is Jerusalem.' [P. 49.] In the old passover the lamb or feast is called the Lord's passover; and yet was neither the lamb nor the feast His passing over: but the sign and commemoration of His passing by.... This is no small sacrament, nor yet irreverently to be entreated; but it is the most glorious and highest sacrament, with all reverence and thanksgiving to be ministered, used, received, preached, and solemnly in the face of the congregation to be celebrated... Jesus ...shall so come again even as ye have seen Him go hence" [not in another manner or other body except that it will be glorified].

(F.) JOHN FRITH. B. 1500. D. 1533.

(G.) SIR THOMAS MORE. B. 1480. D. 1535.

Christ's faithful martyr is set first. The persecuting Chancellor is introduced in connexion with Frith, because his language against Frith is much less violent than that which he

“breathed out” against Tyndall. For we love not violent words, and their smoke hindereth a distinct view of men’s opinions. John Frith was a native of Westerham in Kent, and for his love of learning was sent to Cambridge where his spirit caught life from Tyndall, to whom he became a trusted and loving friend. But when the great English Cardinal, Wolsey (whose great faults should not blind us to the nobleness that struggled for the mastery within him, which originated and partly carried out several most noble designs), heard of John Frith’s attainments, he appointed him to be received on the highest of all Oxford’s high foundations, Christ Church. Bernard Gilpin was another whom Wolsey chose. But it was not long before Frith’s activity for truth among his fellows caused him to be transferred to a prison, and to fly to the continent of Europe, where Tyndall was hiding and working at his immortal English version of the Bible. At Sir Thomas More’s removal from the Chancellorship, from whatever reason, we find Frith in two years at Reading: and there followed him one of Tyndall’s noble letters combining warning and confirmation. But it was too late; the young logician was already a confessor to the Scriptural teaching on this sacrament in direct antagonism with Sir Thomas More, so that we have a preface and letter of Frith’s and then a following of Sir Thomas More’s reply sentence by sentence after the manner in which Bp Jewel followed Mr Harding. This ensured Frith’s being pursued and seized. Through Cranmer’s desire to save him, his conductors suggested his escaping, as afterward did Latimer’s captors. But both refused to fly, deeming that the faith needed exhibitions of true courage to die for Christ.

Sir Thomas More, a native of London, was at Christ Church, Oxford, while it bore the name of Canterbury College. His close friendship with Erasmus, and his conscientious resistance to Henry’s divorce from Catherine, which cost him his head, cannot blind us to the fact that he was a hard pleader against the simplicity of this sacrament, and a bitter persecutor. He that made good men martyrs in Christ’s cause ended with the glory of a kind of martyrdom to commend his memory to posterity. Perhaps however his *Utopia* is the brightest spot in his renown. Many Continental church summaries and histories notice neither him nor Frith. But neither ought to be ignored, at least by an English compiler.

*Works of Tyndall, Frith and Barnes.* 3 Vols. Palmer & Co.  
London, 1831.

Frith's Preface, Vol. III. 321. "I chanced...to be in company with a Christian brother... This brother... desired to know my mind as touching the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ ... He desired me to...write... I took on me to touch this terrible tragedy, which, beside my painful imprisonment, is like to purchase me most cruel death... Mr More...hath sore laboured to confute it... I cannot well judge what the cause should be that his book is kept so secret...he never touched the foundation that my treatise is builded upon... I will thereupon build a little more. [P. 324. Frith's 'little treatise that' he 'wrote unto his 'friend,'] It is not (Christ's) presence in the bread that can save me, but His presence in my heart through faith in His blood, which hath washed out my sins and pacified the Father's wrath toward me. [P. 325.] We say again that though ye have (as it appeareth unto you) the evident words of Christ, and therefore consist [stand] in the bark of the letter, yet are we compelled, by conferring [comparing] of the Scripture within the letter, to search out the mind of our Saviour which spake the words... We do it to satisfy our consciences which are compelled by other places of Scripture reasons and doctors so to judge of it. [First Frith quotes S. Aug. ad Dardanum. 'The same faith saved us 'which saved our fathers' (i.e. under the law before it)]... They all did eat Christ's body and drink His blood spiritually, and by the spiritual eating were saved as well as we are. [P. 327.] And by that faith was (Abraham) saved, and yet never did eat His flesh with his teeth, nor never believed that bread should be His body and wine His blood. [P. 329.] Bede added *fide manente signa variata*. [The signs are changed but not the faith.] The manna was to them as the sacrament is to us, and they ate even the same spiritual meat that we do: yet were they never so mad as to believe that the manna was changed into Christ's own natural body; but understood it spiritually, that as the outward man did eat the material manna, which comforted the body, so did the inward man through faith eat the body of Christ... And likewise do we eat Christ in faith both before we come to the sacrament and more expressly through the sacrament and...after we have received the sacrament, and need no more (to) make it His natural body than the manna was...so doth the inward man through faith eat the body of Christ.

P. 331. "And so both they and we do eat one spiritual meat. That is to say, We both eat the thing, which signifieth and representeth unto us the very one spiritual meat of our souls, which is Christ. [P. 332.] The second cause of their institution is

to be a means to bring us unto faith and to imprint it deeper in us. [P. 333.] Even as that bread doth nourish the body, so doth faith in His body-breaking nourish the soul unto everlasting life. Thus did our merciful Saviour...to establish and strengthen their faith in His body-breaking and blood-shedding, which is our shot-anchor and last refuge, without which we should all perish. The third cause. They that have received these blessed tidings and word of health do love to publish this felicity unto other men and to give thanks before the face of the congregation unto their bounteous Benefactor. [Then follows a notably good but unrefined illustration of a man going to 'an ale-pole' and not entering the house itself where the refreshment is to be had.] For if we think to have our sins forgiven for eating of the sacrament, or for seeing the sacrament once a day, or for praying unto it, then surely we (go to) the ale-pole. [P. 335.] Let us therefore...go to the very thing which the sacrament is, and there shall we find such fruitful food as will never fail us, but comfort our souls unto life everlasting, &c. &c. Thus endeth my little treatise."

*Sir T. More's answer, as quoted in the further treatise. P. 342.*

"(Frith) toucheth in a few leaves shortly all the poison that Wickliff, Ecolampadius (Huskyn), Tyndall and Zuinglius have taught in all their books before concerning the blessed sacrament of the altar: not only affirming it to be very bread still, as Luther doth, but also, as these other beasts do, saying it is nothing else. [P. 349.] He must needs confess that they that believe that it is the very body and His very blood indeed, have the plain words of our Saviour Himself on their side for the ground and foundation of their faith. [P. 352.] If every man that can find out a new-found phantasy upon a text of Holy Scripture may have his own mind taken and his own exposition believed against the expositions of the old cunning doctors and saints, then may you surely see that no article of the Christian faith can stand and endure long. [Huskyn is Hauschein.]

P. 410. "I am very sure that the old holy doctors, which believed Christ's body and blood to be there, and so taught others to believe, as by their books plainly doth appear—if they had thought either that it [Christ's body] could not be there [upon the table] or that it was not there indeed, they would not for all the good in this world have written as they have done. For would those holy men (ween you) have taught that men be bound to believe that the very body and blood of Christ are there, if themselves thought they were not bound thereto? Would they make men honour and worship that thing as the very body and blood of Christ which themselves thought were not it? This gear is too childish to speak."

*Frith in reply.* P. 412. "I will not deny but that these holy doctors in diverse places do call it His body, as Christ and Paul do, and so do we likewise, and say also that His very body is there eaten. But yet we mean that it is eaten with faith (that is to say by believing that His body was broken for us) and have His body more in memory at this maundy than the meat (food) that we there eat. And therefore hath it the name of His body, because the name itself should put us in remembrance of His body, and that His body is there chiefly eaten, and even more, through faith, than the meat with the mouth.

P. 44. "That the holy doctors and faithful fathers so taught (as More affirms) or thought as ye feign of them, is very false. For St Austin, as I have shewed, maketh wholly for us, &c. And touching the honour and worship done unto it, I say it is plain idolatry. And I say that he falsely reporteth on our old holy doctors, for they never taught men to worship the sacrament, neither can he allege one place in any of them all which would have men to worship the sacrament...Such as St Austin, Ambrose, Jerome, Cyprian, Cyril, Chrysostom, Fulgentius and such other. These I say do not teach men to worship it; and by that I dare abide. Of this point I am so sure that I will use it for a contrary argument, that His natural body is not there present.

*Note.* These extracts may suffice for Frith and More. I wonder at More's fallacy, a *petitio principii*, in saying that the very words of Christ are for the theory of the presence of Christ's natural body, when the very question under argument is whether they ought to be interpreted in their literal or in their figurative sense. An English scholar, gentleman and judge, like More, to make such a logical mistake! But to be candid, the latter extracts lead us further. Two educated Englishmen both of undoubted intellectual power and of considerable learning, in the midst of their discussion and in a part of it where it seems to me that they both deemed themselves to be speaking with more clearness than usual, make exactly opposite assertions about the true and sincere meaning of the greater fathers. More and Frith evidently entirely believe the reverse of each other's honest conviction. Surely this is a question that ought to be decided. More says those fathers did believe the real natural body of Christ to be in the place of the bread and wine: and says he is sure they believed it, because they so expressly taught it. And he adds that if they had not believed it, all the good on earth would not have tempted them to teach it as they did. Frith

denies all this and stakes his whole argument upon the fullest and most express and particular denial that he can set down in writing. It is time surely that this question were adjudged.

If it be generally accepted, as Tyndall and Chillingworth hesitate not to admit, that (1) armies of quotations from accredited fathers, particularly in and after the fourth century, may be found favouring the presence of Christ's natural body after consecration in this sacrament, and (2) not a small number of passages distinctly against it, and (3) hosts upon hosts of passages in which confusion of the two contrary ideas more or less reigns, to what issue are we of necessity driven? Surely to this we must come, that so heterogeneous a compound as the patristic and catholic church-literature of eighteen centuries must be void of ruling authority in whole and in part, and that the real use of the extant documents of any and every age, since the closing of the Scripture canon, is to assist us in forming our own judgments, first, of the words in Holy Writ that bear in any way upon this sacrament, and secondly, what dogmas and what practices in the administration of it are in harmony with the fair interpretation of Scripture and what contrary to it, or at least not in harmony with it.

As far as unity can be attained on the first point there is hope of accordance in the second. To minister to the attainment of unity in the first point and accordance in the second is one of the most ardent wishes in the heart of the compiler of these volumes. What More and Frith did in their day as to discussion and investigation must now be done again, and perhaps it may be done finally. Upon us the ends of the periods seem to be meeting: and it is delightful to think that in the shaking to pieces of false pre-judgments the supreme glory of God's word may again as at first stand up without a rival.

(H.) BISHOP MYLES COVERDALE. B. 1488. D. 1569.

We read of him at Cambridge in connexion with Dr Robert Barnes, the hasty but unstable Reformer, and the real first of the Reformers there, Bilney, who twice recanted in those ambiguous days, and then weeping left Cambridge spontaneously "to go" as he said "to Jerusalem." The glory of Coverdale was to carry on

and complete Tyndall's unfinished English Bible. In 1563 he not only took an English degree of D.D. at Cambridge, but was empowered by the Vice-Chancellor to admit Grindal to the same.

*Exhortation to the carrying of Christ's cross.* "Remains."

Parker Soc.

P. 262. "Whereas they require the intent of the priest, to consecrate Christ's body, forasmuch as we know not any man's intent (God only knoweth the heart)—yea the words we know not—they are spoke in *hurker mucher*, I pray you in what a doubtfulness are we brought whether there be a sacrament or not. Judge whether Christ hath more bodies than one, when perchance the priest hath 20 or a 100 before him. [P. 266—9. A sharp but fair attack.]

P. 471. *The defence of a certain private man.* "But they will say, Christ is not so sacrificed in the mass that He dieth again upon the cross; but it is for the remembrance of the same sacrifice that once was made. *Why do they then call it a sacrifice*, seeing it is but a remembrance of a sacrifice? And why say they that it may be done for other, seeing that of itself it is no such work, but only a remembrance? &c. He (Christ) saith not, Offer My body and My blood. Wherefore let the right and true remembrance of the Lord's supper remain in the congregations, and let us shew the Lord's death till He come.

P. 268. "Last of all where they make a similitude, that as by baptism the minister *applieth to the child regeneration*, so here, &c. (*i.e.* in the mass). O that the similitude were well looked to! in baptism the child is alive, but here the man is dead. In baptism the child is present, but here (if alive) the man is perchance 40 miles off: yea 100 miles.

Vol. II. *Fruitful lessons.* Treatise on the sacrament. P. 440. "They be called body and blood, because they be, as it were, *instruments whereby Christ distributeth them* (*i.e.* the body and blood) *unto us* (!) It is a spiritual mystery which can neither be seen with the eyes, nor comprehended with the wit: therefore (as the weakness of our nature requireth) it is set forth to us *with visible* figures and signs, but yet under such a sort that *it is not a bare and simple figure*, but *joined unto His verity and substance*. The bread thereof (not unworthily called His body) forasmuch as it doth *not only* represent it unto us, but also *bring into us* the same thing. [P. 441.] It is given I say of God, the certain and unchangeable verity. If so be, that God can neither deceive nor lie, it followeth that He doth in very deed perform and fulfil all that He doth here signify (*i.e.* represent by signs). No remedy therefore—we must unfeignedly receive the body and blood of

Christ in the supper, forasmuch as the Lord offereth to us therein the communion of them both...In like manner as the bread is distributed in the hand, so is the body of Christ communicated to us that we should be partakers thereof. We understand that in the supper Christ giveth unto us the very substance of the body and blood, &c." [How opposite to Tyndall's teaching!]

(I.) JEROME [GIROLAMO] SAVONAROLA. B. 1452. D. 1498.

Yet another Jerome added to the list! But Dr Milman has given a picture of him. Yet Walter Barham's little book may be thought to shew a livelier impression of his distinguishing marks. His piety is transcendental but wonderfully real. He lives on the verge of the supernatural. His prophecies indicate a strange combination of shrewd foresight with the most fantastic guesses at the meaning of passages in the Revelation. There are those indeed who would fain similarly designate all historic præterite interpretations of that book. But they should know that the late Sir James Stephen, certainly not unversed in history, wrote to a modern expounder of the Revelation, the Rev. E. B. Elliott, that if any reliance is to be placed on any amount of historic evidence, the general course of his interpretation of the Apocalypse might be deemed to be fully established. But Savonarola's interpretations are as wild and random guesses as Augustine's, though he had inherited nearly a thousand years more of the world's accumulated experience and knowledge. But his temperament was electric. It is the love of God and the charm of moral goodness that glorifies Savonarola. Huss wrote that his Christians were ready to die for the truth. So was Savonarola. Witness his famous reply to the proposal to stifle his opposition by putting a cardinal's dignity upon him. "No red hat will "I have but that which is tinged with my own blood." He must have foreseen that he should follow Huss. But he could not foresee that their united deaths would save Luther by putting the German princes and noblemen on their guard. Charles V. is said to have regretted in his monastery that he let Luther escape alive. But the escape of Henry of Hesse of Marburg probably saved many of the first "Protestants" from a prison if not a bloody death. But hardly a hand was lifted up to save the great Augustine prior. It always reads to me as if his game had been



played out. He had had his day, and carried out his own favourite ideas, as afterwards did Zwingel in Zurich and Calvin in Geneva. Nothing remained. His schemes could not last for ever. They were impracticable. They were the reform bill of a monk, and differed materially from the true freedom which belongs to Christians. Still this very age cries out for men with the heroism of Savonarola. There are many bonfires required to purge Christian cities: and much moral reformation is needed even within the bounds of churches that hold spiritual truth and profess Protestantism. Still the reform will hardly be tried again in Savonarola's way, not even in America.

But of Savonarola and the Lord's supper. I happened to extract from him and Isaac Ambrose consecutively. One has only to compare the spiritual character of their personal piety to see how distant sometimes is the world of the heart from the world of the intellect. Not that Isaac is a clear Protestant or Bible Christian on this point: but this Jerome is even a still more thorough Transubstantialist than Huss.

*Fourfold exposition of the Lord's prayer*, published in a vol. beginning with *A Treatise on the Simplicity of the Christian Life*. (Black letter.) Venice, 1504, by Lazarus Soard.

I. P. 66. On "Give us this day, &c." "That man is compounded of two substances, *i.e.* (those) of soul and body. Since he is fragile and weak in both natures, he requires food for the spirit and for the body. Therefore (first) the bread for the soul is asked for, spiritual food, which is the word of God, according to that (saying), 'Man liveth not in bread alone, but in every word 'that goes forth from God's mouth'—and the sacrament of the eucharist, according to that saying, 'My flesh is truly meat and

---

*Expositio quadruplex super orationem Dominicam, cum libello de simplicitate vitæ Christianæ. Venetiis, 1504, per Lazarum Soardum. (Aureus Liber.)*

I. P. 66. "Panem nostrum quotidianum da nobis hodie." Quod homo componitur ex duplici substantiâ, sc. anima et corpore. Cum sit fragilis seu debilis in utrâque naturâ, indiget cibo spirituali et corporali. Petitur ergo hic panis animæ, cibus spiritualis, quod est verbum Dei, juxta illud, "Non in solo pane vivit homo, sed in "omni verbo quod procedit de ore Dei:" et sacramentum eucharistiæ, juxta illud, "Caro Mea vere est cibus, et sanguis Meus vere est potus."

'My blood is truly drink.' Therefore another evangelist says, 'Give to us our supersubstantial bread' [wrong translation]; corporeal bread for the body is also asked, &c.

P. 70. "Meditation...O my soul, since thou art more precious than the body, we ought first to seek thy food, which is the word of God and the body of Christ, Who is the food of thy body [I should rather think that the author wrote 'quod' 'which;' still it may be a case of attraction, and mean the same]. But not all who read or hear God's word, and take Christ's body, take it from God's hands. For they that learn continually afresh the Scriptures or hear them read, simply to know them, or to be known, but not that they may be made holy and may work (thereby), do not receive the bread of God's word from God's hand but from their own hands; and they that in sin approach to the sacred rite of the eucharist do not take the bread of Heaven from the hands of God. Let us therefore say to the Heavenly Father, 'Give to us to-day our daily bread for Thy word that I may not fail (as a Christian) in the way'...May our Father daily feed us and inwardly nourish us by enlightening our hearts with Divine charity, that we may taste and see how sweet the Lord is. For unless He Himself shall have inwardly enlightened us and set our hearts on fire, in vain do we take our bread, i.e. God's word and Christ's body. On any day and at each hour, if it can be done, we ought to eat God's word by reading, praying, meditating and contemplating, singing and making melody in our hearts, returning thanks to God spiritually by Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour.

---

Ideo alius evangelista dicit, "Panem nostrum supersubstantialem," &c. Petitur et pro corpore corporalis panis, &c. &c.

P. 70.

De meditatione... O anima mea, cum sis pretiosior corpore, prius debemus querere cibum tuum, quod est verbum Dei, et corpus Christi, Qui cibus corporis tui. Non autem omnes, qui legunt vel audiunt verbum Dei et sumunt corpus Christi, sumunt illud de manibus Dei. Qui enim Scripturas addiscunt vel audiunt, ut sciant duntaxat aut ut sciantur, non autem ut sanctificentur et operentur, de manu Dei panem verbi Dei non accipiunt sed de manibus suis; et qui cum peccato accedunt ad sacrum eucharistiæ, panem cæli de manibus Dei non sumunt. Nos ergo Patri cælesti dicamus, "Panem nostrum "quotidianum in verbum Tuum da nobis hodie; ne deficiam in viâ"... Quotidie nos Pater noster pascat et nutriet intus, illuminando corda nostra charitate Divinâ, ut gustemus et videamus quam dulcis est Dominus. Nisi enim Ipse intus illuminaverit et accenderit corda nostra, in vanum sumimus panem nostrum, i. e. verbum Dei et corpus Christi... Qualibet die et singulis horis, si fieri potest, verbum Dei comedere debemus, legendo meditando orando et contemplando, cantantes et psallentes in cordibus nostris, Domino gratias agentes spiritualiter per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum et Salvatorem.

So we ought also to take the most sacred bread of Christ's body spiritually at least daily, in a devout manner, that is to say by hearing the mass and joining alike in its celebration with the priest. Often also let us take that mystic bread sacramentally according to our heart's devotion and our spiritual father's advice, &c.

III. P. 78. Prayer. "Excite our devotion that we may humbly and devoutly approach to the marvellous sacrament of the precious body and the blood of Thine only-begotten Son our Lord Jesus Christ, that we may grow into health in Him, that walking in the strength of that food from virtue to virtue we may reach the heavenly kingdoms.

IV. P. 80. "For the righteous, by contemplation elevated to so lofty things, set no value on all these earthly things...nor can they take delight in other than heavenly food, i.e. in the Scriptures of God and in Divine offices, and in sacraments, in which they are daily engaged, and yet are never satisfied. They flee from men, they despise the multitudinous gatherings of the city. [Florence is specially alluded to—a republic of a certain kind with the Medici at its head—or after the expulsion of Piero when it became more republican.] They constantly seek out the flourishing pastures of eternal life, crying out after their own Lord and saying, 'Give us our bread, &c.'"

The short preface of this work to Philip Valorius who had earnestly solicited its publication is both graceful and valuable.

Sic et panem sacratissimum corporis Christi quotidie saltem spiritualiter sumere debemus devote, sc. audiendo missam et cum sacerdote pariter concelebrando. Sæpe etiam sacramentaliter illum mysticum panem sumamus juxta devotionem cordis nostri consiliumque patris spiritualis, &c.

### III. *Quæ dicitur oratio, p. 78.*

Excita devotionem nostram, ut humiliter et devote accedamus ad mirabile sacramentum corporis pretiosi et sanguinis unigeniti Filii Tui Domini nostri Jesu Christi, ut in Eo crescamus in salutem, et in fortitudine cibi illius de virtute in virtutem ambulantes perveniamus in regna cælorum, &c.

### IV. *p. 80.*

Justi enim contemplatione ad tam excelsa elevati, nihili faciunt hæc omnia terrena...nec possunt in aliis delectari quam in cibis cælestibus, hoc est in Divinis Scripturis et in officiis Divinis et in sacramentis, in quibus quotidie versantur nec tamen satiantur. Fugiant homines; contemnunt multitudinem civitatis. Virentia pascua vitæ æternæ perquirunt, ad Dominum suum clamantes atque dicentes, Panem nostrum, &c. &c.

I would fain transcribe it. He was the lay head of the party of Savonarola.

*The Triumph of the Cross*, trans. by Odell T. Hill. London, 1868.

P. 84. "How is it that two contrary effects should result from the same sacraments? The heat of the sun hardens the earth and melts ice. A tree planted in the earth produces, under the influence of the sky, flowers and fruit: and if it be torn up, then under the same influence it dies. Consequently the two opposite effects of the sacraments do not result from a chimerical or vain cause; but they issue necessarily from the different even opposite manner with which men use holy things in the worship they render to God.... If the exterior worship of the Christian religion did not depend upon—if it did not contain Divine virtue and truth, necessary to form a first instrumental cause, it could never produce, maintain and consummate that excellent effect, Christian holiness: for it is by itself that it acts in this way, since the Christian life, which is wholly spiritual and partly intellectual, could never be produced by material causes. Of what avail in fact for the soul are water, oil, balm, incense, bread, wine, altars and other things of that kind, if they were not instruments of a superior cause? [*Note.* This we deny that they are, as possessing any power in themselves or of themselves], or rather if these sacred rites were merely a falsehood of man or dæmon—a superstitious rite—how could they be *the source* of such a holy life? Some one may perhaps object that this worship is not *the cause* of the perfection—that it merely exercises the virtues and faith, &c., &c. But, &c., &c. And besides as God is the sovereign truth, the more *we approach Him*, the more we are inundated with His light, and the more we depart from Him we are enveloped in a greater darkness and error. But do we not know that pious Christians, who devotedly frequent the holy mysteries, receive from that Divine worship such an abundance of joy that they are ravished beyond themselves? We see their faces, resplendent with the rays of holiness, acquire traits the most amiable and worthy of veneration. Formerly doubtless these marvellous effects were more frequent than to day. Still in our time we know of men who experience them—men not only amongst the simple but among the wise and learned, &c., &c.

P. 183. "It is fitting that these sacraments, as *the instrumental cause*, should *confer grace*, although the virtue *does not extend to the ultimate effect of grace*. We say that grace, being a supernatural gift, *cannot come from the creature*, nor the virtue of the sensible element. These sacraments do not attain to the essence of grace; but only to a disposition thereto.

P. 185. "Under the appearance of bread, however small it may be the body of Christ is contained wholly and entire, &c., &c. At the same time Christ is in Heaven wholly and entire."

*The Golden Book. On the simplicity of the Christian life.* Venice (black letter), at Lazarus Soard's. 1504.

Book I. Eleventh conclusion, leaf 22, page 2. "Of all ceremonial acts a devout and frequent use of the sacrament of penance and communion is better than the use of other ceremonies for augmenting and keeping grace. For church-ceremonies divide themselves into two classes, so that some confer grace as instruments out of the mere performing of the act: but that some do not confer grace except by the effort of the person that performs them, i.e. by the devotion of him that does them. The sacraments indeed of the new law stand first, which are the principal among ceremonies, because the rest are ordained for their sake. But that you may understand that these sacraments confer or cause grace, you must know that an instrumental cause is that which has a double virtue: one indeed out of its own form, but another by the motion of the principal agent. For a saw has power to cut, from its own form, which is of the material of iron: but it has not that which brings about the forms of actual cutting, except by the motion of its principal agent. We must therefore know that one kind of instrument does reach its ultimate form....Another kind does not attain to its ultimate form. We say then that the sacraments of the new law are instruments of grace: not that they

*Aureus Liber. De simplicitate vite Christianæ.* Venetiis, apud Lazarum Soardum. 1504. *Lib. I. Conclusio XI. p. 22, 2.*

[N.B. I write æ, for which e was then put.]

Inter opera cæremonialia devotus et frequens usus sacramenti pœnitentiæ et eucharistiæ est potior ad augendam et conservandam gratiam quam usus aliarum cæremoniarum. Cæremonialia namque ecclesiæ sunt in duplici differentiâ: quod quædam conferunt gratiam instrumentaliter ex opere operato; quædam vero non conferunt gratiam nisi ex opere operantis, i. e. ex devotione facientis illa. Prima quidem sunt sacramenta novæ legis, quæ sunt principalia in cæremonialibus, quia ad ista cætera ordiuntur. Ut autem intelligatis quod hæc sacramenta conferunt vel causant gratiam, sciendum est quod causa instrumentalis duplicem habet virtutem. Unam quidem ex propriâ formâ: alteram vero ex motione principalis agentis. Serra enim ex propriâ formâ, quæ est in materiâ ferri, habet quod secet. Sed, quod formas secandi inducat non habet, nisi ex motione principalis agentis. Est ergo sciendum quod aliqua instrumenti virtus attingit ultimam formam... Aliqua autem non attingit usque ad ultimam formam... sacramenta igitur novæ legis dicimus esse instrumenta gratiæ:

extend to the producing of grace itself; for this comes from God only by creation: but they go as far as to produce a state of mind, and this state of mind is the disposition nearest to the reception of grace, unless indeed the recipient place an obstacle in the way. But that the sacraments in this way do confer grace as instruments, is not only clear by the authorities of the holy fathers, but also there are reasons to persuade us that it is so. ... We know by daily experience...that all who submit their hearts to the sacraments of the church, and chiefly those that frequently use with devotion the sacrament of penance and communion, grow in that Christian life by the spirit, than which no better mode of life, as it is said, can be found. So that, the better and holier they grow day by day, the more devoutly and fervently they receive these sacraments. And the more devoutly they receive these sacraments, the better do they daily become. But on the other hand, they that irreverently frequent these sacraments, and chiefly the sacrament of thanksgiving, are made by it the worst of all men, as is plain in the cases of clerks and religious persons that are wicked. But this certainly could not be, unless somewhat of Divine virtue were in the sacraments, as must be on those that are instruments of God, ordained specially to effect grace in those that are disposed to good. [He then proceeds to prove these two, eucharist and penance, more useful than all the other sacraments.] We must therefore know that some sacraments can be repeated and some not. For those that leave an indelible mark cannot be repeated, as baptism, confirmation and orders; but some can be

non quod pertingant usque ad gratiam quæ est a Deo solum per creationem. Sed pertingunt usque ad characterem, qui quidem character est dispositio ultima ad susceptionem gratiæ, nisi suscipiens præstet impedimentum. Quod autem hoc modo hæc sacramenta instrumentaliter conferant gratiam [confero is an illogical statement; to prepare to receive is the utmost fact] non solum sanctorum auctoritatibus clarum est; sed et aliquâ ratione potest persuaderi. Experimento quotidiano cognoscimus... omnes qui sacramentis ecclesiæ se subjiciunt, et maxime qui devote frequentant sacramentum penitentiae et communionis, in vitâ Christianâ sp (spiritu) erexere, quâ nulla melior, ut dictum est, inveniri potest. Ita quod quanto quotidie meliores et sanctiores fiunt, tanto et devotius et cum majori fervore hæc sacramenta suscipiunt. Et quanto devotius hæc sacramenta suscipiunt tanto quotidie meliores fiunt. At contra qui irreverenter hæc sacramenta frequentant, maxime sacramentum eucharistiæ, efficiuntur peiores omnibus hominibus, ut patet in clericis malis et religiosis. Quod certe esse non posset, nisi in his sacramentis aliquid Divinæ virtutis inesset, tanquam in his quæ sunt instrumenta Divina ad effectum gratiæ in bonum dispositis specialiter ordinata. Est ergo sciendum quod (horum) sacramentorum quædam possunt iterari et quædam non. Nam ea quæ imprimunt characterem, qui indelebilis est, iterari non possunt, ut baptisma et confirmatio et ordo: quædam autem iterari possunt,

repeated but not frequently, as marriage and extreme unction : but some can be both repeated and frequently used, as penance and the eucharist....But the sacrament of penance makes man turn aside from evil : that of communion turns the soul to good. For by the first sins are blotted out ; by the second we are conformed to Christ. Therefore the frequent use of them makes us perfect in justice. Besides, the sacrament of communion really contains Christ, Who is the Fountain of the whole of grace, which other sacraments have not. Since therefore all ceremonial church-rites are ordained with reference to the sacraments, and all other sacraments with reference to that of the eucharist, as to the most noble amongst them and the most perfect, and all are yet ordained to cause augment and preserve grace, it is evident that the sacrament of communion is in a nearer relation to the causing augmenting and preserving of grace than any other sacrament whatever. And since none can approach to this sacrament that is not purified, the sacrament of penance is an accompaniment to it, and therefore the frequent use of this mystery brings on the devotion of Christians, and the gifts of grace accrue more abundantly than by other ceremonials. Besides, since all other ceremonies are ordained with reference to the sacrament of communion, as we have said, therefore a Christian man, coming to it devoutly, first disposes himself and prepares his soul, by first purifying it with penance and confession of sin and then by adorning it with good works. He also raises his mind to God by holy readings and

---

sed non frequentari, ut matrimonium et extrema unctio. Quædam vero et iterari et frequentari possunt, ut pœnitentia et eucharistia... Sacramentum autem pœnitentiæ facit declinare a malo : sacramentum communionis convertit animam ad bonum, nam per primum delentur peccata ; per secundum conformamur Christo. Ergo frequens usus istorum nos in justitiâ perfectos reddit. Propterea sacramentum communionis continet realiter Christum qui est fons totius gratiæ ; quod non habent alia sacramenta. Cum ergo omnia cæremonialia ecclesiæ ad sacramenta ordinentur, et omnia alia sacramenta ad sacramentum eucharistiæ, tanquam ad nobilissimum inter ea et perfectissimum, et omnia tamen ordinentur ad gratiam causandam augendam et conservandam, patet quod sacramentum communionis propinquius se habet ad gratiam causandam et augendam et conservandam quam quodlibet aliud sacramentum. Etenim ad hoc sacramentum nullus accedere debeat nisi purgatus, sacramentum pœnitentiæ concomitat ipsum, et ideo per frequentationem hujus mysterii accedit devotio Christianorum, et gratiæ dona accrescunt magis quam per alia cæremonialia. Præterea cum omnia cæremonialia ad sacramentum communionis ordinentur, ut dictum est, Christianus, devote accedens ad ipsum, prius disponit se et animam præparat, purgando eam primo per penitentiam et confessionem peccatorum, deinde bonis operibus ornando. Mentem quoque per lectiones sacras et meditationes sanctas et orationes devotas contem-

saintly meditations and devout prayers and Divine contemplations, and enkindles himself to Divine love and to the contemning of earthly things. By this it comes to pass that, by the foregoing dispositions and by the efficacy of the sacrament and by the renderings of thanks which follow its reception, grace is marvellously increased in him and a Divine fervour and readiness of will and all good actions. And thus by frequenting these rites the Christian grows by little and little and is changed to other ways of living, and is made more than good, as is plain in the primitive church, when Christians used to communicate daily. For so fervent were they, that they reckoned martyrdoms and death as nothing. Yea with alacrity of countenance and great desire they used to long for them. But in our times, after almost all Christians have dropped to the reception of the communion only once in the year, and with a moderate degree of preparation, they are become the worst of men and worse than heathens, and are daily made worse. For they confess once a year and yet return to the practice of the same sins, always making promise to God that they will lead good lives, and never keeping their promises. There are priests without number who without devotion or reverence frequent the holy communion, and they become worse than laymen; and there can be nothing worse than this in the church. Since then Christians have forsaken the true worship of God, they have by this time come down to so blind a state, as not to know even what their own name means. For they know not what it is to be a Christian, and in what true worship of God consists. For their attention is given to external

---

plationesque Divinas ad Deum elevat Seipsum in amorem Divinam et in contemptum terrenorum accendit. Unde fit per dispositionem præcedentem et per efficaciam sacramenti et per gratiarum actiones sequentes post assumptionem ejus, ut in eo mirabiliter augeatur gratia et fervor Divinus et promptitudo voluntatis ad omnia opera bona. Et ita hæc frequentando Christianus paulatim crescit et in alteras vias mutatur, et efficitur plusquam bonus, sicut patet in primitivâ ecclesiâ, quum quotidie Christiani communicabant. Adeo enim ferventes erant ut martyria et mortem pro nihilo reputarent. Immo alacri vultu et magno desiderio ipsa desiderabant. At cum nostris temporibus, postquam fere omnes Christiani ad hoc redacti sunt ut tamen semel in anno communicent et cum modicâ præparatione, facti sunt pessimi et pejores etiam paganis, et quotidie pejores efficiuntur. Singulis enim annis confitentur, et tamen ad eadem peccata revertuntur, semper Deo promittentes boni vivere, nunquam promissionem servantes. Innumeri quoque sacerdotes qui sine devotione et reverentiâ sacrum communionis frequentant: facti sunt pejores laicis; quo nihil posset esse deterius in ecclesiâ. Quia ergo Christiani verum cultum Dei reliquerunt, ad tantam hodie cæcitatem devenerunt, ut ignorent et nomen suum quod significet. Nesciunt enim quid sit esse Christianus, nec in quo consistat verus cultus Dei. Exterioribus enim cæremoniis occupati interiorem cultum igno-



ceremonies and they are ignorant of inner worship. For they never or seldom read the Scriptures, and when they read they do not understand, and when they understand they have no inward relish of it. Yea they say, 'Our soul loatheth this light bread. 'Who will give us Cicero's eloquence, the poets' sounding words, 'and the sweet fluency of Plato and the subtle divisions of Aristotle? For this Scripture is simple and fit to be the food of silly 'women. Preach subtleties to us.' And so preachers follow the people, and not maintaining sound doctrine they are turned to vain talking, heaping to themselves teachers after their own desires with itching ears, and turning themselves away from the truth, they turn the tongue to fables. The princes also, and the nobles and the heads of the people refuse to hear the truth, but say, 'Preach to us pleasant things. Deceive us with various flatteries. 'Say lies to us. Report to us good things.' And on this account the body of Christian people has to day fallen into a state of the greatest spiritual darkness. For if we were to live well and to read and preach the Scriptures and the holy doctors, there would be no occasion for me to write thus. For the Scriptures and the saintly writers, if they be searched with a pure mind, say all this. As therefore I have treated upon what the Christian life essentially consists in, and by what instruments it is principally preserved and augmented, whereas, as I have said, the next topic should be simplicity of heart, it follows that we treat upon that subject now."

This extract from the Golden Book, which is almost one entire chapter, gives us a specimen of the writer's intelligible

---

rant. Nunquam enim vel raro Scripturas legunt, et legentes non intelligunt, vel intelligentes non gustant. Immo dicunt, Anima nostra nauseat super cibo isto levissimo. Quis nobis det ut audiamus eloquentiam Ciceronis et verba poetarum resonantia et Platonis dulce eloquium et subtilitates Aristotelis? Hæc enim Scriptura simplex est et mulierculorum cibus. Prædicate nobis subtilia. Et ita prædicatores sequuntur populum, et sanam doctrinam non sustinentes conversi sunt in vaniloquium, ad sua desideria coacervantes sibi magistros prurientibus auribus, et a veritate se avertentes ad fabulas linguam convertunt. Principes quoque et optimates et capita populorum nolunt veritatem audire, sed dicunt, 'Prædicate nobis placentia. Decipite nos adulationibus variis. Dicite nobis mendacia. Annunciate nobis bona.' Et propter hoc populus Christianus in maximis tenebris hodie obscuratus est. Si enim bene viveremus et scripturas sanctosque doctores legeremus et prædicaremus, non opus esset mihi hæc scribere. Nam Scripturæ et sancti, si purâ mente investigentur, hæc omnia dicunt. Quum ergo de vitâ Christianâ, in quo essentialiter consistat, et quibus instrumentis principaliter conservetur et augeatur tractavimus—cum, ut diximus, ad eam sequatur simplicitas cordis, consequens est ut de hac simplicitate tractemus.

eloquence, and a photograph of the manners of his time. It also contains some leading Reformation truths, while side by side with them stand some of the current errors, which he had not been able to discover and discard.

(J.) JOHN COLET, DEAN OF ST PAUL'S. B. 1466. D. 1519.

This friend and patron of Erasmus must stand for ever in a lofty niche in the temple of Christian worthies, were his founding of St Paul's School in his native London alone considered. But his bold part in the educational struggle, that displaced Duns Scotus and Aristotle from being the standing instructors of Christendom, gives him a second title to a very high place in Christian history. That the friend of Erasmus did not take up Luther's mode of producing reformation of the corrupt Christianity of the times, but rather sought a reform by re-introducing order and morality instead of boldly rehandling the elementary ideas of a man's personal salvation according to the Scriptures, is no matter of wonder. Colet entered Oxford the year after Luther was born; and Colet also died when the day of Luther and Zwingel was only dawning, and we cannot tell what line Colet would have taken had his appearance in the world been later, or had his life lasted much longer. Fuller's account of him in *Abel Redivivus* has several of that author's diamond-pointed sayings. The small portrait of Colet in that work bears a singular similarity to that of Erasmus. There is in Colet the same pointed earnestness of feature, with a greater amount of heroic sturdiness. This may be partly owing to the full development of physique which Colet enjoyed from his birth, and which the early position of Erasmus utterly denied. The portrait of Erasmus is mind over-informing its bodily tenement; but Colet's person is that of an athlete and a very determined one. It was his work, in beating our Aristotle, to reintroduce not only Scripture but also Plato and Plotinus. Mr Lupton of St Paul's School in editing some of Colet's treatises gives us from the British Museum's Catalogue a surprising account of the proportion between Platonizing and Aristotelizing works: but then the reign of the latter was more recent. Mr Lupton's introductory essay

gives us the account of Colet in his public exercises breaking through the custom of basing his addresses on some subdivision of the scholastic works, by reading and expounding the epistles of St Paul. Colet has the glory of being the first to do what the great German and Swiss Reformers followed him in doing; viz. planting their feet in their public teaching on the inexpugnable fortress and rock of God's word in the New Testament. Zwingel took Matthew, and Luther the Galatians. Colet, says Fuller, was not then full 30 years of age. Fuller says the deanery of St Paul's, though "highest in rank was not deepest in the manger," but its wealth seems amply to have sufficed for a dean of Colet's temperate habits; and, surviving alone out of eleven brothers and as many sisters, he inherited a large estate. His father had been twice Lord Mayor of London, and Colet now was popular, and preached and lectured continually in London. Over the master's head in St Paul's School he set up a statuette of "the child Jesus," with a legend below it "*Ipsium audite,*" Hear him. Erasmus wrote for the school a grammar, and the dean "*A Practical Treatise on Religion.*" Colet like Erasmus honoured and digested several of the fathers. But in giving the list unhappily Erasmus uses the doubtful term "*iniquior erat Augustino,*" and Fuller says, "He was disguised with Augustine," *obscurum per obscurius.*

If Colet was averse to Duns Scotus and to the Scottistry of Fitz-James, Bishop of London, he appears to have had a still more fervent opposition to Thomas Aquinas. But all this, though needful to one whose mission was to work in removing their Egyptian bondage, and introducing the true liberty of God's word, is hardly a fruitful state of mind. It is far easier to refuse to press on so far into those disparaged oceans of theology as to form a fair notion of the truth contained in their endless mincings and distributings, than to see the real services that they rendered to buried truth. Dean Milman says he only knew four living persons who had read parts of Thos. Aquinas, and he cannot bring himself to believe there are four more! This sentiment is not I think deserving of being quoted with honour: but then neither do I think that Sir Thomas More can be upheld by the Dean against Froude's facts. Demaus on Tyndall writes differently, and in his line holds with Froude concerning More.

P. 89. "Although however he desires to be free in God's sight, yet the thing is not accomplished till the sacrament is in the midst of being ministered by the ministers of God, which is the efficacious test at once of the Divine and human will to remit (offences). Hence springs the plan itself of the sacrament's making sacraments into sacraments. Our God-man Himself Jesus Christ, Who laid down sacraments between God and men as witnesses and treaties of their accordant wills, who Himself remitted and relaxed the bonds of sins, also instituted a sacrament of the remission of sins and of the reconciliation to Himself of those men whom God wills to be reconciled to Him: and He wills to mark at once by an opportune method the Divine will in man and the human will in God.

P. 93. A sacrament of communion in the common provision of flesh and blood, which sacrament, of that which is conjoined and of the unity of those that are strengthened and made spiritual, is a feeding and nourishing together in Christ in the highest unity. For we are called that we may be cleansed illuminated and perfected by the Spirit, nourished together, live together, fight and conquer together and be glorified together. This is the power of the affection of spiritual men.

P. 84. "When any one is in the hands of ministers to be cleansed and to wash with tears and wipe away the filth of sins,

*On the sacraments of the Church, p. 89, London, 1867.*

Veruntamen quamquam in Deo vult esse liber, tamen res non conficitur, nisi medio sacramento ministrato a ministris Dei, quod testis efficax simul et Divinæ et humanæ voluntatis remittendi. Hinc sacramentorum sacramenta ratio ipsa sacramentificans. Deus homo Ille noster Jesus Christus qui jacuit (jecit) sacramenta inter Deum et homines, testes et fœdera coeuntium voluntatum, qui remisit Ipse et relaxavit peccatorum vincula, etiam remissionis peccatorum et reconciliationis hominum Sibi quos vult Deus reconciliari, instituit sacramentum: voluitque Divinam voluntatem in homine et humanam voluntatem in Deo opportunâ ratione consiguari.

P. 93.

Sacramentum communionis in communi pabulo carnis et sanguinis, quod sacramentum, conjuncti et unitatis est confirmatorium et spiritificatorium, est in Christo in summâ unitate coaltio et connutritio. Vocatur enim ut purgemur illuminemur et perficiamur Spiritu, connutriamur, convivamus, compugnemus, convincamus, conglorificemur. Hæc vis charitatis spiritualium hominum.

P. 84.

Quum in manibus ministrorum est aliquis ut purgetur, utque colluviem peccatorum lacrymis lavet et absterget, vel catechumenus

either a catechumen or a penitent or a possessed person or an apostate, although he be in the church again, he is not counted, nor is he of the hierarchy and body of Christ, in which no one can be unless he is cleansed and perfected. From this it appears that all bad persons are not in the church but outside that they may be cleansed, &c.

---

vel penitens vel energumenus vel apostata, tametsi is rursus sit in ecclesiâ, non numeratur, nec est ex hierarchiâ et corpore Christi, in quo nemo esse potest nisi purgatus et perfectus. Unde constat omnes malos non esse in ecclesiâ sed extra, ut purgentur, &c.

Seven Sacraments for Colet's School of St Paul. "By gracious euchariste, where is the very presence of the person of Christ, under form of bread, we be nourished spiritually in God.

*Exposition of St Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians.* London, 1874.

Chap. x. p. 106. "St Paul by way of protest leaves them with this maxim which he would have them thoroughly believe, that with whomsoever a man voluntarily partakes, with the same is he a companion and fellow-worshipper; and that if the Corinthians voluntarily mingled with idolaters and took part in their feasts, they could not be worshippers of God in Christ. For whoever is in Him must be wholly in Him—must savour wholly of Christ—must neither know nor do anything but what befits the simplicity and purity of Christ's Spirit within Him. 'Ye cannot,' says St Paul, 'drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils, &c., &c.' We ought to emulate and copy the example of Christ, for we are not stronger than He; nay in Whom alone we are strong. And therefore we ought not to attempt anything without Him, without Whom we are weak, &c., &c. [Then, p. 107, How does He sum up?] In the blessed cups, the broken bread there is a saving communication of the very body and blood of Jesus Christ *itself* [What really can a modern Roman say more?]: which is received in common by many, that they may be one in it. [P. 108.] That is the one nourishment, on which we are fed, distributed to the whole society as to one body: that all men being nourished by the one, may be one in that by which they are nourished—not themselves assimilating the nourishment, but being *transformed by it, as by the stronger into itself*. [Who that has read Gregory of Nyssa can fail to recognize his manner of reasoning in this?—[P. 110.] Those books only ought to be read in which there is a salutary flavour of Christ. ... Those books in which Christ is not found, are but a table of devils. Do not become readers of philosophers, companions of devils. [I have added this not because I think it generally true: but to give full occasion to those who

would argue that the former passages, to which I have objected, are only figurative just as this is. I do not see it so. What terms are to be said to involve the assertion of Christ's real bodily presence if these are not? And if they do, where is the limit to the harmfulness of using language, which certainly implies the real natural presence of Christ's body, if language *has* a definite meaning?]

Chap. XI. p. 116. "In His own supper our Lord imparts Himself wholly to us, that He may transform us wholly unto Himself and make us members together with Him: that so there may be one body, so to speak; consisting of Himself as the Head, and its proper members, wholly possessing and possessed by God. [Had Colet stopped there no one would have said anything: but he does not stop there.] And this He does not only in regard of our souls, by the communication of His Divinity; but also in regard of our bodies, *by the communication of His body*, that we may grow altogether into one body in Him.

The question is, Do these corporeal expressions imperil those that admire the rest of what he says? And do they not strengthen those who believe in the real natural presence of the body of Christ in this sacrament? The cue was given chiefly in the Fourth Century, and very few have stood clear from following it. Are we to go on doing the same, mingling the sweet words of spiritual truth with the bitter waters of the doctrine of real true corporeity; or are we at length to draw a line and distinguish between antagonistic terms, and to settle what they are? The usage of figurative expressions is plainly according to Scripture: but express assertions of rejected error must not be confounded with figures rhetorically employed. I give another instance.

P. 116. "We are now in the temple, that we may all feed on the sacred Victim, and all be partakers of the altar of God, yea of God Himself offered upon the altar of the cross, that we may be crucified together with Him, and be offered as sacrifices well-pleasing to God." [Who could object to this?]

## THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

(A.) DURAND DE ST POURCAIN IN CLERMONT, A DOMINICAN.  
BACHELOR AT PARIS 1513. D. 1533.

THIS town in which he was born is in the diocese of Clermont. Though he earned the name of Doctor Resolutissimus, it did not prevent his advancement first to the post of master of the palace and then in succession to the bishoprics of Puy and Meaux. He deemed himself free to profit by all the great men of the past without being sworn adherent to any. But then he, most happily for his own peace and prosperity in Christendom, as it then was, arrived at the conclusions that were then deemed orthodox. He wrote a treatise on the origin of jurisdiction, which Rohrbacher, vol. x. 554, triumphs in citing in connexion with the opinions of Ivo of Chartres in the eleventh century, Hugh of St Victor in the twelfth, Alexander Hales and Thomas Aquinas in the fourteenth on the same subject, as holding, together with them, the supremacy of the spiritual over the secular power. He took the degree of bachelor at Paris in 1513: and joined the order of Preaching Brethren. His views on theology in general and on the Lord's supper in particular display an amount of hardy courage, which was nevertheless compensated by his profession of perfect submission to the church. But to use his own favourite phrase he rather regarded church authority as a *res sine quâ non*, than as the real fountain of opinion. Thinking minds must have long worn the harness of subjection to church authority in a very loose way in their private researches, and must have champed the bit in secret for generations before any dared to throw it all aside, and rejudge the church judgments in their public writings or speeches. This is seen even after the Reformation. Even such minds as Leibnitz and Descartes stooped

to bear the bit and bridle. How little then is it to be wondered at that such bright intelligences as Gerson and Durand wore the chains of subjection, though they shook them at times, as if they wished to be free!

Acuteness and neatness are said to be this writer's characteristic marks. Thomas Aquinas, under whose standard he at first led, he afterwards opposed. His great work is his commentaries on Peter Lombard in four books; and he opposed Pope John XXII. on the vision of God by the pious dead before the resurrection. He exercised his own judgment without stint upon Aristotelian dogmas; but he extended the idea of receiving many Christian dogmas by faith rather than looking for their full apprehension by the understanding. Perhaps on some other points he changed from the current views to his own damage. But certainly his views on the Lord's supper merit attention. One almost wonders he dared to speak so boldly. Perhaps the most useful course is to transcribe the heads of his Questions on this subject.

P. 267. "(1) Whether the eucharist is a sacrament. (2) Whether the forms of consecration of bread and wine are convenient. (3) Whether they are connected. (4) Whether the body of Christ can lawfully be taken after medicine, or after food taken after the manner of medicine. (5) Whether there are two modes of eating this sacrament. (6) Whether the eating of the sacrament is of necessity unto salvation. (7) Whether it is for man only to receive the sacrament of the eucharist. (8) Whether a sinner sins mortally if he take the sacrament of the eucharist. (9) Whether a person sins mortally if he partake of the sacra-

*Commentaria in Petrum Lombardum*, p. 267. Paris, 1550.

Utrum eucharistia sit sacramentum.

Utrum formæ consecrationis panis et vini sint convenientes. Utrum  
...connexa.

Utrum corpus Christi possit licite sumi post medicinam vel post cibum sumptum per modum medicinæ.

Utrum sint duo modi manducandi hoc sacramentum.

Utrum manducatio eucharistiæ sit de necessitate salutis.

Utrum solius hominis sit sumere sacramentum eucharistiæ.

Utrum peccator sumens hoc sacramentum eucharistiæ peccet mortaliter. (P. 301. Utrum scienter participans cum excommunicato peccet mortaliter.)



ment with an excommunicate person. (10) Whether a priest be allowed to give the eucharist to a man whom he knows to be in mortal sin. (11) Whether the body of Christ that was born of the virgin be really in the sacrament of the eucharist. (12) Whether the whole Christ be in the eucharist. (13) Whether the body of Christ be moved when the host is moved. (14) Whether the body of Christ can be seen in the eucharist by a glorified eye. (15) Whether the body of Christ is in the eucharist by conversion of the bread into itself, or whether the substance of bread remain with the body of Christ. (16) Whether God can convert anything whatever into anything whatever. (17) What kind of change there is of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. (18) Whether bread from corn and wine of the vine are a convenient material of the eucharist. (19) Whether water ought to be mixed with wine in the sacrament of the eucharist. (20) Whether a priest can consecrate bread and wine in any quantity whatever. (21) Whether if a priest intend to consecrate only ten hosts, and he find eleven, has the eleventh been consecrated. (22) Whether God can make any accident whatever without a subject. (23) Whether the species in a sacrament can sacramentally change anything in it. (24) Whether (consecrated wine) ceases to be the blood of Christ by the admixture of new wine to the species of it. (25) Whether the effect of the eucharist is an augmentation of grace or love.

---

Utrum liceat sacerdoti dare eucharistiam illi quem scit esse in peccato mortali.

Utrum corpus Christi natum de virgine sit realiter in sacramento eucharistiæ.

Utrum totus Christus sit in eucharistiâ.

Utrum corpus Christi moveatur ad motum hostiæ.

Utrum corpus Christi in eucharistiâ possit videri ab oculo glorioso.

Utrum corpus Christi sit in eucharistiâ per conversionem panis in ipsum, vel utrum cum corpore Christi remaneat substantia panis.

Utrum Deus possit convertere quodlibet in quodlibet.

Qualis sit conversio panis et vini in corpus Christi et sanguinem.

Utrum panis de frumento et vinum vitis sint conveniens materia eucharistiæ.

Utrum aqua miscenda sit vino in sacramento eucharistiæ.

Utrum sacerdos possit consecrare panem et vinum in quantâcunque quantitate.

Utrum sacerdos intendens consecrare tantum decem hostias, si inveniat undecim, an undecima sit consecrata.

Utrum Deus possit facere quodlibet accidens sine subjecto.

Utrum species sacramentalis possit aliquid sacramentaliter immutari.

Utrum desinat esse sanguis Christi per admixtionem novi vini speciebus vini consecrati.

Utrum effectus eucharistiæ sit augmentum gratiæ seu charitatis.

(26) Whether it is praiseworthy to take the eucharist every day. (27) Whether the consecrating of this sacrament is properly suitable for priests (only). (28) Whether it is lawful for priests to give up celebrating the mass. (29) Whether many priests can consecrate the same mass. (30) Whether priests only are allowed to minister the sacrament of the eucharist to the people. (31) Whether heretics are to be tolerated. [To the last question it is answered on one side 'Yes, because Jews and infidels are, and they believe less.']

P. 277. "It is asked whether water ought to be mingled with wine in this sacrament. And it is argued that it ought not, because the mingling of it is either required of necessity to the sacrament, or 'of congruity' to it. It is not required of necessity, since bread and wine only are said to be the material of this sacrament. Nor is it required of congruity in order to the union of Christ with His people, being signified by receiving His blood under the species of wine, just as we are united with Him by receiving His body under the form of bread. But water is not set by the bread to signify the aforesaid union: therefore it is not to be set by the wine, as it appears. Also it is not read [in the New Testament] that Christ set water by [i.e. added it to] the wine, nor ordained that it should be added. It seems rash therefore that, beyond His instituting and ordaining, water should be added to the wine.

Utrum sit laudabile sumere sacramentum eucharistiæ omni die.

Utrum consecratio hujus sacramenti proprie conveniat sacerdotibus.

Utrum liceat sacerdotibus cessare a celebratione missæ.

Utrum plures sacerdotes possint eandem missam consecrare.

Utrum solis sacerdotibus liceat sacramentum eucharistiæ populo ministrare.

Utrum hæretici sint tolerandi.

P. 277.

Quæritur utrum vino sit admiscenda aqua in hoc sacramento. Et arguitur quod non; quia aut admixtus esset de necessitate sacramenti vel de congruitate. Non de necessitate quia solum panis et vinum dicuntur esse materia hujus sacramenti. Nec de congruitate, ut per hoc significetur unio populi cum Christo per sumptionem sanguinis sub specie vini, ita ut unimur Ei per sumptionem corporis sub specie panis. Sed pani non apponitur aqua ad significandum prædictam unionem: ergo non vino est apponenda, ut videtur. Item Christus instituens hoc sacramentum non legitur apposuisse aquam vino, nec ordinasse quod apponeretur. Ergo temerarium videtur quod, præter Ejus institutionem et ordinationem, apponatur aqua vino.

P. 275. "To the first it must be said on the other side, that in these things regarding faith we must not always choose what is followed by the fewest difficulties, &c. But we must lay down what is most in harmony with the sayings of holy men and with church tradition, though more difficulties may come in our way. For we must bring our intellect into captivity to the obedience of the faith. To the second proposition we must say that that only is done in this sacrament which is meant by the form of the words: but secondarily there is done whatever is antecedent to it or concomitant to it for the existing of Christ's body. In this sacrament there is antecedent the transubstantiation of the bread into Christ Himself. But there are concomitant the Godhead united to the body...and quantity and the rest of the accidents, as they say, holding that mode. And therefore both these are effected in this sacrament, that is, the existence of the body of Christ and the conversion of the bread.

P. 276. "Because in permanent things, whatever takes place exists when it is done; but when bread has been changed into Christ's body, it is not true to say that the bread is the body of Christ, as has been said, therefore in the conversion it is not true to say that the bread becomes Christ's body. However because the holy writers do not always observe propriety of speech, therefore some of the aforesaid sayings are found to be said by some saints and chiefly by Ambrose, as said above.... To the first argu-

P. 275.

Ad primum in oppositum dicendum est quod in his quæ sunt fidei non est semper eligendum illud ad quod sequuntur pauciores difficultates, &c. Sed est ponendum illud quod magis est consonum dictis sanctorum et traditioni ecclesiasticæ, licet plures difficultates occurrant. Oportet enim intellectum nostrum captivare in obsequium fidei. Ad secundum dicendum est quod illud solum efficitur in hoc sacramento quod significatur per formam verborum; sed secundario efficitur quicquid ad illud antecedit vel illud concomitatur ad existentiam corporis Christi. In hoc sacramento antecedit transubstantiatio panis in Ipsum. Concomitantur autem Divinitas unita corpori, et quantitas cum ceteris accidentibus, *ut dicunt, tenentes istum modum*. Et ideo utrumque efficitur in hoc sacramento, scilicet existentia corporis Christi et conversio panis.

P. 276.

Quia in permanentibus, quod fit quando factum est, est, sed, quando panis est conversus in corpus Christi, non est verum dicere quod panis sit corpus Christi, ut dictum est, ergo in conversione non est verum dicere quod panis fiat corpus Christi. Veruntamen quia sancti non semper observant proprietatem locutionis, ideo aliquæ de prædictis locutionibus inveniuntur dictæ a quibusdam sanctis, et maxime *ab Ambrosio*, ut dictum supra. [Another excuse for liberty of thought

ment there is a plain answer, that, although that be the common saying of many, yet since it has not been confirmed by the church we are allowed to think the opposite. It is to be said on the contrary that Pope Alexander said it was to be done, and we stand in the same distinction by the sayings of Cyprian. The Lord's cup cannot be water only nor wine only, but that both be mingled together, &c.

P. 274. "It is asked whether Christ's body is in this sacrament by the conversion of the bread into itself, or whether the substance of the bread and wine remain after the consecration. And it is argued that the substances of the bread and the wine remain; because that supposition should be chosen, which entails the fewest difficulties. But by supposing that the bread and the wine remain, only one difficulty follows, which is not a very great nor insoluble one, *i.e.* that there are two bodies together. [This is consubstantiation in its most natural form.] But by supposing that the bread and wine do not remain, many difficulties follow—*i.e.* How can such accidents, (*i.e.* without their substances,) nourish (man's body), become corrupted, and how out of them alone can anything (of a bodily nature) be generated [Qy. in their corruption]. And since all these things come to pass out of the previous material (of bread), therefore as it appears the first supposition is to be adopted. Also that alone is accomplished (made) in this sacrament which is expressed by the force of the words. But by these words [This is My body] is alone expressed the existence or the presence of Christ in this sacrament. And in no word is mention

---

is given before.] Ad primum argumentum patet responsio, quia quamvis illud sit commune dictum multorum, tamen ex quo non est per ecclesiam confirmatum licitum est opinari oppositum. In contrarium est quod dixit Alexander Papa, &c. Et in eadem distinctione ex dictis Cypriani, &c. Calix Domini non potest esse aqua sola nec vinum solum nisi misceatur utrumque, &c. &c.

P. 274.

Quæritur utrum corpus Christi sit in hoc sacramento per conversionem substantiæ panis in Ipsum; vel utrum post consecrationem remaneat substantia panis et vini. Et arguitur quod substantiæ panis et vini remaneant; quia illud, ad quod sequuntur pauciores difficultates, est magis eligendum. Sed ponendo quod substantia panis et vini remaneat, sequitur una sola difficultas, quæ non est multum magna nec insolubilis—scilicet quod duo corpora sunt simul. Ponendo autem quod non remaneant, sequuntur multe difficultates—scilicet quomodo talia accidentia possint nutrire, corrumpi, et quomodo ex eis possit aliquid generari. Cum hæc omnia fiant ex præsuppositâ materiâ, ergo ut videtur primum est magis eligendum. Item illud solum efficitur in hoc sacramento, quod exprimitur per formam verborum. Sed per hæc verba [Hoc est corpus Meum] solum exprimitur existentia vel præsentia corporis Christi in hoc sacramento; et in nullo penitus sit mentio de

made of a defining of the substance of bread, or of its being converted into Christ's body. That therefore is not to be supposed or laid down.

P. 269. "Whether there are two modes, &c. To the first (point) it must be said, Some are spiritually washed from (their sins in baptism), and some sacramentally (only); whether these modes (of defining it) be taken as on the part of the suscipiends of baptism or these modes be to be taken, as was said before. To the second point it must be said, that it is not similar to the eating of bodily food, because the benefit of the body cannot be obtained with only a wish or a desire, as it is in the case of spiritual food. And again no precedent disposition is required in the taker of corporal food, in order to receive its benefit, except natural power; as is required in the receiver of spiritual food [Thus did the scholastics at times, taught of God, put forth their venturous barks into the sea of Protestant Bible truth]: and thus it is not possible to eat bodily food in any other way than bodily. But food is set before us spiritually in the sacrament under the veil of corporal things; by reason of which, beyond that kind of spiritual eating which it is competent to any recipient (to receive) of himself [secundum se], it is possible to him (lit. it happens to him) to eat in a further way, sacramentally, under such a veil." [But as we wonder at the great boldness both of this Durand's enquiries and of his decisions we have to remember that, as in the case of Erasmus, his life occupied the later part of the fifteenth and the former part of the sixteenth centuries. Many morning stars had preceded him and the day was at hand. Thus scholasticism was brighter.]

---

definitione substantiæ panis, vel de conversione ejus in corpus Christi. Ergo istud non est ponendum. [Durand saves his orthodoxy thus.]

P. 269.

'Utrum sint duo modi, &c.' Ad primum dicendum... Quidam... abluuntur spiritualiter (in baptismo), quidam sacramentaliter; sive hi modi sumantur ex parte suscipientium baptismum, sive ex parte modi (de eucharistiâ) suscipiendi, ut dictum est. Ad secundum dicendum quod non est simile de manducatione corporalis cibi, quia fructus ejus non potest percipi ex solo voto vel desiderio sicut est in (spirituali) cibo. Et iterum nulla dispositio præcedens requiritur in suscipiente corporalem cibum ad suscipiendum fructum ejus nisi naturalis virtus; sicut requiritur in recipiente cibum spiritualement: et ideo cibum corporalem non contingit manducare nisi corporaliter. Spiritualiter autem cibus proponitur in sacramento sub velamine rerum corporalium; ratione cujus, præter manducationem spiritualem quæ competit ei secundum se, contingit ei ulterius manducare sacramentaliter sub tali velamine. [To explain the force "contingit" we have but to see the pertinence of the old classical saying, "non cuivis homini contingit, &c." So here, everyone receives not spiritual food.]

(B.) ERASMUS, DESIDERIUS, ORIGINALLY GERHARD.

B. 1467. D. 1536.

It may suffice to mark some of his clustering honours. His great work was *The Paraphrases*, which perhaps put the Reformation in England under greater obligations to him than it came under to any of the singularly valuable band of foreign helpers, whom she allured within her sea-beaten shores. But his many minor exploits surpass our space. *The Greek Testament* printed. A dozen of the chief fathers edited in whole or in part. The scholastic system checked. The monks visited with deserved reprobation. His own *Adagia* compiled. Luther's weak point of the slavery of the will detected and assailed. Origen commended, and the publication of his works far advanced when Erasmus died. The power of elegant satire re-established in this country—a power, without which it seems the course of things in this world can never long go on well. On the whole the religious liberty of the human race advanced in various ways: in a word, the shadow on the dial of human progress moved several degrees onward. As to the other side of his character, in which he fronts Luther and the German Reformation, is it not enough to say that few great men are able, like John the Baptist, to regard with perfect content the superior progress of a rival for public power, and to say calmly “He must increase, I must decrease”? In the Swiss Reformation, at the very beginning of its great Reformer's course, we trace the hand of Erasmus. Zwingel himself relates how some of the sonnets of Erasmus were among the first things that awakened in him the spirit of enquiry. The story will appear in the latter part of this work, and it is notable that there never was any strife or even a misunderstanding between Erasmus and Zwingel. Erasmus and Luther are twin champions in the emancipation of Christendom: but their antagonisms of mind and heart were great. Methinks they are best judged a little apart: for each by contrast brings out the deficiencies of the other. I suppose that beyond question we owe far more to the Saxon miner's son. He, under God's direction, set a large part of Christendom free. But though the Dutch scholar had not the

heroic boldness nor the sweet heavenly-mindedness—the child and the giant in one—that so charmed and shook Christendom, it is not easy to compute how much we all, and Luther too, owe to Erasmus. He was fitted for his work by strong antipathy to the monks—the “frères ignorantins” of his day, and for this antipathy he had stronger reasons both personal and paternal than we like to drag to the light of day.

Two extracts about Erasmus I wish to append from quaint old Fuller’s *Abel Redivivus*; one regarding Erasmus at his death—the other Erasmus in his life. At his death he bequeathed the residue of his property—including the proceeds of his library sold on his deathbed—to John a Lasco, under the direction of the overseers of his will “to be distributed first to “poor infirm persons whether through age or sickness: secondly “to portionless virgins, to procure them husbands; and thirdly to “poor but hopeful young scholars for the advancement of their “studies.” Every line of this reflects both Erasmus’ personal history and the natural kindness of his heart, ripened by the study of Christ’s life and by communion with Him, to Whom he cried as his end approached, “Mercy, sweet Jesus! Lord, loose “these bonds! How long, Lord Jesus, how long! Jesus, fountain of mercy, have mercy on me.” No wonder such an end followed what Fuller declares of Erasmus’ life. After reciting a select list of the benefactions of this unparalleled labourer in the best literature, he sums it up thus, “What a tot quot of “archbishoprics, bishoprics and prebends and fat parsonages might “not this so patroned a clerk (had he had but the conscience to “digest it) have accumulated under one red hat! But he declined “civil preferments as not so suitable to his priesthood, and had “he accepted ecclesiastical, he foresaw...that he should either “ruin his body by discharging, or his more precious soul by neglecting, them.”

It is with pain I notice, that he finished two treatises on the Lord’s supper; but suppressed them.

His mother’s name was Margaret. She died from the cruelty of the times, when he was thirteen; and his father Gerhard did not long survive. To complete his woe his guardians entrapped him as a monastic, that they might divide his patrimony.

P. 229. "He instituted that sacred sign of His own death, that henceforth there might be renewed amongst them a perfect memorial of His own unmeasureable love, in which He hesitated not to expend His own life on redeeming our mortal race, lest at any time the memory of that Divine sacrifice might escape from our minds, by which, (His life), He the most pure Lamb offered Himself a new and true passover on the altar to God the Father for us, and by His own blood rendered Him propitious towards us instead of angry, paying down, for our commissions of sin, the penalties that were due for our wickednesses. But He consecrated this ceremonial sign in two things, by which among men of old time friendship is wont to be conciliated, that that love, with which He expended Himself on His own (followers), might unite us together too, who frequently ourselves also eat of the same bread and drink from the same cup... In like manner recalling with a spiritual kind of initiation the rites of the law of Moses, according to which no expiation from sins used to take place except by the blood of a victim; besides that, signifying in truth that he was consecrating, by a mystery of this kind the new covenant of the gospel profession, &c. And all these things indeed had marked out by certain figures and shadows this sacred Victim, by Which the Lord Jesus, of His own accord delivering His own body to death and pouring out His own blood, was about to expiate the sins of the whole world, reconciling all men freely to God, whoever profess our covenant the New Testament. [A little

*Vol. I. p. 229.*

*Paraph. Matt. XXVI. 26. Beschmann, Hanover.*

Instituit sacrosanctum illud symbolum mortis Suæ, ut subinde renovatum esset inter eos perfectum monumentum immensæ charitatis Ipsius, quâ non dubitavit vitam Suam impendere redimendo mortalium generi, nequando posset elabi ex animis nostris Divini illius sacrificii memoria, quâ purissimus Agnus novum et verum pascha Semetipsum immolavit in arâ pro nobis Deo Patri, Quem Suo sanguine nobis ex irato propitium reddidit, pro nostris commissis dependens pœnas, quæ nostris sceleribus debebantur. Hoc autem symbolum caeremoniale duabus rebus consecravit, quibus inter homines olim solet amicitia conciliari, ut ea caritas, quâ Christus Seipsum impendit Suis, nos quoque copularet, qui frequenter et ipsi ex eodem pane comedimus et de eodem poculo bibimus... Similiter, spirituali quodam imagine referens ritus Mosaicæ legis, juxta quam nulla fiebat expiatio a peccatis nisi per sanguinem hostiæ, præterea significans vere novum fœdus evangelicæ professionis hujusmodi mysterio consecrare, &c. Atque hæc quidem omnia figuris quibusdam et umbris designarant hanc sacrosanctam hostiam, quâ Dominus Jesus, corpus Suum sponte tradens in mortem, et sanguinem Suum effundens, expiaturus erat totius mundi peccata, cunctos homines gratuito reconcilians Deo, quicumque fœdus nostrum Novum Testamentum profitentur. Eam victimam, hoc fœdus



of Luther on the Galatians is wanted here.] He wished this Victim and this treaty to be entrusted to the minds of His own disciples by certain mystic signs before He was sacrificed, that they might understand that His own death was not a common event nor unnecessary, but an efficacious Victim for expiating the sins not of the Jews alone but of all nations and all ages. But since Christ's death was not to be repeated, that it might not slip away from the world out of the minds of men, and that they might not forget the sacred covenant once entered into with the Author of their own salvation, He appointed that by frequent sharing of the sacred bread and cup the memory [of the covenant] might be renewed among those that professed the gospel until He should come not as Saviour but as Judge. In the mean time no other victim for sins was to be looked for, since this one suffices for doing away the sins of the whole world.

P. 280. Luke xxii. 7. "But now that day of the unleavened bread, most sacred to the Jews, will be present, on which according to the requirements of the law the lamb must be killed, which the Jews, as I said, call *phase* from passing over. But the true phase was the Lord, He was the most pure Lamb to be sacrificed according to the Father's eternal counsel for the salvation of the world. By mystic signs to represent with them, what He was about on the morrow to go through on the cross, not unaware how they would be troubled by His own death.

P. 282. "A different perfect passover shall be fulfilled accord-

quibusdam signis mysticis commendari voluit animis Suorum discipulorum antequam immolaretur, ut intelligerent Suam mortem non esse vulgarem neque otiosam, sed efficacem victimam, ad expianda peccata non solum Judeorum sed omnium gentium et sæculorum. Cæterum, quoniam mors Christi non erat iteranda, ne tamen mundo elabi posset ex animis hominum, neve sacrosancti fœderis semel initi cum salutis suæ auctore possent oblivisci, instituit ut crebrâ communionē sacri panis et calicis memoria renovaretur inter evangelicæ professorēs donec adveniat non Servator sed Judex. Interim non erat expectanda alia hostia pro peccatis, quoniam hæc una sufficit pro abolendis peccatis totius mundi.

P. 280, *Luc. XXII. 7.*

Jam vero aderit dies ille azymorum, Judæis sacerrimus, quo juxta legis præscriptiones oportebat occidi agnum, quem Judæi a transitu, ut dixi, vocant *phase*. Verum autem phase erat Dominus. Agnus Ille purissimus, juxta Patris æternum consilium, immolandus pro salute mundi. Mysticis signis hoc apud eos repræsentare, quod postridie peracturus esset in cruce, non ignarus quam Sua morte essent turbabundi.

P. 282.

Aliud perfectum pascha juxta Spiritum perficietur in regno Dei.

ing to the Spirit in the kingdom of God. The truth is present and the shadow will cease. After that, ye will celebrate a spiritual and efficacious passover to Me, the eating of which will render you immortal. But when each one had tasted of the flesh of the lamb Jesus took a cup and gave thanks to the Father, and having tasted and held out the cup, said to His disciples, 'Receive ye and divide ye this among yourselves, &c.' Thus far is the end of the legal figures. [Then bread and wine, &c.] This is the new covenant not of a calf or a goat, but consecrated in My blood which is shed to save you.

P. 170. 1 Corinthians xi. 20. "But now a custom, indecorous beyond measure, has crept in amongst you, that as often as ye meet together, it does not appear to be the Lord's supper that is being conducted, such as He held with His own disciples, but a tumultuous and unbecoming kind of feast, in luxury and excess of eating: without waiting for the rest, each one takes possession of his own supper. Therefore it comes to pass, &c., and that feast of mystic meaning receives the dishonour of a double charge; both that by the haughtiness of the rich the poor are despised, whom Christ despised not, and that the Lord's supper is polluted with excess and luxury. Here is the mystery of Christian oneness of mind, not a matter of the stomach or greediness, which ought to have been provided for not in the public [sacred] assembly but privately in your houses. If you desired to fill yourselves, there is no want to you of houses, where you may do this in separate circles. Despise ye the public assembly of Christians,

---

*Adest veritas et cessabit umbra. Posthæc spirituale et efficax phase Mihi celebrabitur, cujus esus vos reddet immortales. Ubi vero singuli gustassent de carnibus agni, Jesus accepto poculo gratias egit Patri et libato porrectoque calice dixit discipulis Suis, Capite et dividite hoc inter vos, &c. Hactenus legis figurarum est finis. Then bread and wine for the Lord's supper. Hoc est novum testamentum non vituli aut hirci sed sanguine Meo consecratum qui pro vobis servandis effundetur.*

*II. p. 170, 1 Cor. XI. 20.*

At nunc irrepsit apud vos mos supra modum indecorus, ut quoties convenitis, non videatur agi cœna Dominica, qualem Ille cum Suis egit, sed tumultuosum aliquid et indecorum convivium, quod per luxum et gulæ intemperantiam, non expectatis cæteris, suam quisque cœnam occupat. Itaque fit ut, &c., ac mysticum illud convivium duplici nomine dehonestetur; et quod per fastum divitum pauperes fastidiuntur, quos non fastidiit Christus, et quod cœna Dominica crapulâ luxuque polluitur. Hoc unanimittatis Christianæ mysterium, non ventris aut gulæ negotium, quod non in publico cœtu sed privatim in ædibus curatum oportuit. Si libebat explere alvum, non desunt domus, in quibus seorsim hoc agatis. An publicam Christianorum congregationem

- that ye indulge your appetites with the assembly for a witness of it, &c., that those are put to shame, who have nothing to contribute? V. 23. Having given thanks to God, He orders the bread and said, 'Take ye, eat ye, this is My body, which is broken 'for you,' to be shared among you all. Do ye also afterwards do for a remembrance of Me that which ye see Me do. Ye see here all together with their Teacher, reclining together. The table and the food He Himself made common to all, and not even Judas the traitor removed from sharing at the table. In the same manner after the distribution of the bread He took the cup also into His hands, after the supper was done, saying, &c. Christ willed this feast to be a commemoration of His own death and a sign of the eternal covenant, &c. The bread is mystical, of which all ought to be equally partakers. The cup is sacred, equally belonging to all, by no means prepared to appease bodily thirst, but to represent a secret thing, that it may not come to be forgotten at what a price ye have been redeemed from the vices of your former life. Wherefore as often as ye meet to eat this bread and drink of this cup ye are not engaged in a matter of the appetite but are representing the death of the Lord Jesus by a mystic rite. And let the perpetual memory of it hold you fast in your duty, until He Himself come again to judge the world. Therefore whoever shall eat this bread or drink this cup of the Lord otherwise than is worthy of Him, renders himself also chargeable with a great crime who has handled the body and blood of the Lord otherwise than He Himself had ordered it to be treated. Since a thing above all

---

contemnit, ut, hac teste, gulæ serviatis, &c. ut pudeant tenues, qui quæ offerant non habent? V. 23. Gratiis actis Deo jubet panem, ac dixit, Sumite, edite. Hoc est Meum corpus, quod pro vobis frangitur, omnibus impartiendum. Hoc quod Me facere videtis posthac et vos faciatis in memoriam Mei. Videtis hic cum Præceptore suo simul omnes accumbentes. Mensam ac cibum Ipse communem omnibus, ne Judam quidem proditorem a consortio mensæ semotum, &c. Ad eundem modum post distributionem panis et poculum sumpsit in manus, cœnâ jam peractâ, dicens, &c. Christus hoc convivium mortis Suae commemorationem, et æterni fœderis symbolum esse voluit, &c. Mysticus est panis cujus ex æquo participes esse debent omnes. Sacrosanctum est poculum, ad omnes æque pertinens, haudquaquam paratum ad placandam corporis sitim, sed ad arcana rei representationem, ne vobis veniat in oblivionem, quo pretio sitis a pristina vitæ vitiis redempti. Proinde quoties ad edendum hunc panem aut bibendum ex hoc poculo convenitis, non ventris negotium agitis, sed mortem Domini Jesu mystico ritu representatis. Cujus jugis memoria vos in officio continueat, donec Ipse rursus adveniat judicaturus orbem. Itaque quisquis ediderit panem hunc vel biberit de poculo Domini secus quam Illo dignum est, et gravi crimini se reddit obnoxium qui corpus et sanguinem Domini secus tractavit quam Ipse tractari jusserat. Siquidem res, omnium maxime

most mystical ought to be treated purely and reverently; but lest that should happen, let everyone first examine and search himself. So may a man well eat of that bread and drink of the cup. But if he be partly conscious with himself of evil let him rather abstain and sacrifice to his appetite at home. For although it be a healthful thing, yet whoever eats and drinks the body and blood of the Lord unworthily, it is turned in his case to a plague and destruction, because he approached so great a mystery irreverently and with an uncleansed mind, not sufficiently considering with how great a trembling the body of the Lord is to be received. They will pay the penalty of having profaned the mystery as soon as the King shall have come. Nevertheless in the mean time also a punishment for the committal of the offence presses upon some, &c. But if we ourselves would judge ourselves before receiving it, we should not in any wise be thus judged by the Lord. Wherefore, my brethren, when ye assemble to these feasts He has commanded you mutually to wait for each other in a feast without distinction of ranks after Christ's example. But if any one be so greedy of food as not to bear delay, let him eat at home, not in the mystical and public feast; lest what was instituted for your salvation be turned into an occasion of condemnation. And I think that enough has been said on this thing. On the rest of the things pertaining to this subject, I myself will prescribe, when I shall have come to you.

1 Cor. xi. 28. "If any priest do not acquiesce in the church's decrees, it will be exceedingly hard to prove to the sense of men in what form of words he should consecrate (in the supper). For

---

mystica, pure ac reverenter erat tractanda; verum ne id accidat, se quisque prius examinet atque exploret. Ita sibi bene edat de pane illo et de poculo bibat. Parum vero sibi conscius abstineat potius, et domi gulæ suæ sacrificet. Licet enim res sit salutifera corpus et sanguis Domini, tamen quisquis edit aut bibit indigne, huic vertitur in pestem atque exitium, propterea quod irreverenter et illoto animo tantum adierit mysterium, non satis perpendens quanto cum tremore sumendum sit corpus Domini. Dabunt hi pœnas prophanati mysterii simul atque Rex advenerit. Quamquam et interea urget quosdam pœna commissi, &c. &c. Quodsi nos ipsi judicaremus ante sumendum haudquâquam sic judicaremur a Domino, &c. Proinde, fratres mei, cum ad has epulas convenitis, jussit, ad exemplum Christi convivium æquabile, vos invicem expectare. Quod si quis tam avidus est cibi, ut dilationem non ferat, domi comedat, non in mystico publicoque convivio, ne quod ad vestram salutem est institutum vertatur in occasionem damnationis. Atque hac de re jam satis dictum est. De cæteris, quæ ad hanc rem pertineat, ipse prescribam ubi venero.

*Test. Nov. cum notis. Vol. VI. 1 Cor. XI. 28.*

Nisi quis acquiescat in ecclesiæ decretis difficillimum fuerit probare sensui humano quibus verbis consecret sacerdos. Nam ut donemus

though we grant that Christ consecrated in words of this kind, how does it appear that an agreement has been entered into with us that, if we repeat the words of another, we also ourselves consecrate it (effectually)? But here in St Paul's words the intellect of man must be led captive to obedience to the faith, that the merit of faith may be the more [Think of Erasmus writing thus!] in proportion as the reason of man is the less able to grasp it. V. 29. For neither did our Lord always consecrate His body as often as we read that He gave thanks and brake bread, since He blessed and brake supplying a feast to many thousands, and in Emmaus He blesses and breaks and hands the bread to them. Again, as often as mention is made in the books of bread being broken it is not straightway to be received that the body and blood of the Lord was consecrated among the disciples; as for instance, in Acts ii., mention is twice made of the breaking of bread which took place daily from house to house individually. Also Paul, Acts xxvii., in his voyage blesses and breaks bread, inviting the others to take food, and as is very likely handing to them bread broken [for them].

P. 1175. Catechism v. On signs. "Those that have spoken with greater exactness call a sacrament an oath or an obligation, consecrated by the intervention of a deity and of religion. But our ancestors have accommodated that word to signify what the Greeks call mystery, which you interpret a religious secret. Why is it called a secret? Because the multitude was shut out from

---

Christum ejusmodi verbis consecrasse, qui constat hoc factum, nobiscum initum, ut referentes aliena verba consecremus et ipsi? Verum hic captivandus est, ut inquit Paulus, intellectus humanus in obsequium fidei, ut hoc majus sit fidei meritum, quo minus assequitur humana ratio. [This last is one of many sentences that seem strange to come from the pen of Erasmus.] V. 29. Neque enim semper Dominus consecravit corpus Suum, quoties legitur gratiis actis fregisse panem, siquidem benedixit et fregit, convivium exhibens multis hominum millibus. Et in Emmaunte benedicit frangit et porrigit panem. Rursum quoties in libris fit mentio fracti panis, non statim accipiendum est, inter discipulos fuisse consecratum corpus et sanguinem Domini, quemadmodum in Actis cap. ii. bis fit mentio fractionis panis, quæ peragebatur quotidie per singulas domos. Item Paulus Actorum c. xxvii. in navigatione benedicit et frangit panem, invitans alios ad sumendum cibum, et, ut est verisimile, panem fractum porrigens.

*Vol. V. p. 1175, Cat. V. de Symbolo.*

Qui exactius locuti sunt sacramentum appellant jusjurandum, aut obligationem, numinis et religionis interventu consecratum. At majores nostri vocem eam *accommodarunt* ad significandum id quod Græci dicunt *mysterium* quod religiosum arcanum possis dicere. Quare dicitur arcanum? Quia ab his tractandis secludebatur vulgus. Quamquam

having to do with them. Although at this day many things in them are done openly (as when the water of baptism is consecrated), but these and also the words by which the thing is done were concealed from the people and were delivered among the bishops from hand to hand, that the veneration of the sacraments might be more. As soon as the bishop was preparing to consecrate the bread and the cup, no layman was allowed to remain within the rails. And indeed a Roman pontiff, having given some replies to a certain English bishop who made some enquiries of the rites of the [Christian] mysteries, about the words with which chrism-oil was consecrated, dared not commit it to writing, lest perchance by the interception of his letters (a thing of common occurrence) the secret might be generally divulged.

P. 1174. "Others think that the eucharist, which is sometimes called *συναξίς*, i.e. reconciliation, is marked by the name 'communion,' because by this mystery is marked and confirmed the most intimate uniting of the mystical body with the Head, and such a mystical fellowship of all that truly profess Christ's name, as the natural (union) of all the members in the body of the same animal with one another. Those I say who have written such comments say indeed the truth, but in my own opinion do not express what these words declare...."

*hodie* multa sunt palam (veluti quum consecratur aqua baptismi), sed hi ritus atque etiam verba quibus id peragitur, celabantur populo, et inter episcopos per manus tradebantur, quo major esset sacramentorum veneratio. Simul ut episcopus apparabat consecrare panem et calicem, nulli laico fas erat intra cancellos remanere. Et quidam Romanus pontifex episcopo cuidam Anglo, ni fallor, scitanti quiddam de ritibus mysteriorum, quum nonnulla respondisset, verba, quibus oleum consecrabatur non ausus est literis committere, ne forte, quod sæpe fit, literis interceptis arcanum evulgaretur.

P. 1174.

Alii communionis nomine [i.e. in the Apostles' Creed] putant designatam eucharistiam, quæ Græcis interdum dicitur *συναξίς*, id est conciliatio, quod hoc mysterio figuratur et confirmatur arctissima conjunctio mystici corporis cum Capite, et omnium Christi nomen vere profitentium talem societatem mysticam, qualis est naturalis omnium inter se membrorum in corpore ejusdem animantis. [How could Erasmus reconcile himself to writing good Latin in the usual un-Latin order of the words!]. Hæc inquam qui commenti sunt vera quidem prædicant, sed quod his verbis proprie declaratur meo quidem animo non exprimunt. [I wonder such a scholar as Erasmus ventured on giving this meaning to *συναξίς*.]

(C.) DR MARTIN LUTHER. B. 1483. D. 1546.

How diverse the faculties which God deals out among great men! Few indeed of the greatest have reached the high moral eminence of Luther: and yet can any one whose mind moves under the dominion of strict logic venture to call the notable sermon of Luther's on the Lord's supper a right use of man's noble faculty of reasoning? Is it too much to say that a man who could write this was not able to reason where his affections were enlisted? He substitutes for argument assertion and reassertion in various forms. But the struggle between Luther and Zwingel on this subject, which reached its climax at Marburg, must be deferred to the latest Part. It can then be taken up and treated of in company with a few other chief writers who must be dealt with otherwise than by bare citations, and with a short remark or two, set in the interstices, or following at the close of extracted passages. Such are Hooker, Dean Goode and the present Bishop of Winchester, Dr Pusey and Dr Wiseman. Meantime in these volumes some things are cited from some of them, to avoid leaving an undesirable historical chasm: but they will obtain more adequate notice, where room will be more abundant and a just judgment more possible. But his *De Babyl. Cap. Eccles.* is a different matter, no quotations can represent its excellence. Much of it is like liquid gold. It enriches us as we read; and we say, What an extraordinary man! It was this that brought over Bugenhagen, who loaded it with praise. But much in his four volumes is excellent.

I have just come from another of Luther's works and from the latest and most telling controversy (Hare's) respecting his merits, and it is hard to do him equal justice both ways. If one speaks of the largeness of his noble heart, and of his eagle glance in detecting great truths almost hopelessly involved in the confusion of thought of untold ages, one seems to be implying that on any subject he may be taken for a sure and safe guide. If, on the other hand, one charges his mind with defectiveness of logical perception, it seems as if we cannot be making true charges against the man who brought to the front such invaluable truths. Perhaps the solution of the seeming incongruity may be, that he saw many things clearly through the unusual fervour of his feel-

ings, when they happened to take the right direction; but when they happened to take the wrong it was all over with him. Logic had no sufficient power to make him hesitate and reconsider. He seems to have generally seen and reasoned with the heart only. Fuller touchingly relates how Luther's widow, Catharine de Bora, was neglected by Luther's friends, and how sad the way in which she came by her death.

*Sermon on the Eucharist*, VII. 335. "We believe that Christ's body and blood truly are in the bread and wine. We use the plain and open words of the Scriptures and of Christ. Words so open and so simple...that if twisted down to another meaning they are drawn from their natural signification.... Now it is beyond measure pleasing to God to do those things which to the world's judgment are most stupid and absurd, as Paul testifies in the first of Corinthians... [Very rashly put, as if God delighted in it for pure opposition, instead of saying when truth requires it.] He who has erred from this faith may afterwards both believe and commemorate whatever he will by the sacrament. It is not of much consequence... We already see that six or seven sects have emerged within two years, thinking differently about the sacrament, and they all had brought themselves to this persuasion, that Christ's body and blood are not in the sacrament.... [Strange ground for rejecting the one point in which there is such singular concord!] My course is to believe those things: further, what He said, Who knows not how to lie, this will I believe and maintain without a doubt. He thus fortifies Himself by the word and involves Himself in it; and from it He does not suffer Himself to be torn away: and by this also he is saved.... For nothing of an ambiguous or obscure nature can be in words that are

*Sermo de Eucharistia*, Vol. VII. p. 335, 2 parts. Wittenberg, 1558.

Nos credimus in pane et vine veraciter esse Christi corpus et sanguinem. Nos planis et apertis Scripturæ et Christi verbis utimur. Verba tam aperta et simplicia... ut, alio detorta, trahantur a naturali significatione... Jam Deo supra modum volupe est ea facere, quæ mundi judicio stultissima et absurdissima, teste Paulo primâ ad Cor. i. ...Qui ab hac fide aberravit, ille postea quidvis et credat et comminiscatur ex sacramento. Haud magni refert... Jam videmus sex aut septem sectas intra biennium emersisse, super sacramento dissentientes, quæ tamen omnes eam sibi persuasionem persuaserant Christi corpus et sanguinem non in sacramento esse... Meum est ista credere; proinde quicquid Ille dixerit, Qui mentiri nescit, hoc indubitate credam et servabo. Ita verbo Se munit et implicat, a quo avelli Se non sinit; per quod etiam conservatur ille... Nihil enim ambiguitatis aut obscuri-



so open and so simple. To receive bread, to give thanks, to give, to command, to eat and to drink. This is My body. This is the cup of My blood. For we know that Christ's body exists, doubtless that it was born of the virgin Mary, that it suffered, and that it died, and that it rose again.... If the voice can do so much as to fill all ears...why cannot Christ do this much more efficaciously and powerfully by His own body? How much better and more enlightened a thing is a glorified body than a bodily voice?... Besides I preach the gospel concerning Christ, and by bodily voice indeed bring Christ into your heart.... [Does Christ's body get into our heart by preaching? if not, *inter non similia non constat ratio*. It is not to the point in hand—the presence of Christ's body.] Wherefore he that can attain to this by faith...to him neither is that other hard to be believed, that Christ's body and blood are in the sacrament.... It is not to be comprehended by reason in what way Christ puts His body and His own blood into bread and wine.... Consecrating the bread with these words we do not at all doubt that Christ is certainly present. ... As He is wont to come into the heart without making any hole [in it or in our body], but is comprehended by the mind, when we have but heard the word, so also He migrates into the bread, so that there is no need of a hole being cut in it for Him to enter by. ... [The same *analogia falsa inter non similia*.] But what is the meaning of Christ going up to heaven? We must catch from it the persuasion that He is above all creatures and in all things [Is His body in all?] and outside all...for there is no need that by spoken words He be drawn down from heaven into the bread...for Christ is every-

---

tatis inesse potest verbis tam apertis et simplicibus. Panem accipere, gratias agere, dare, jubere, edere et bibere. Hoc est corpus Meum. Hic est calix sanguinis Mei. Scimus enim quod Christi corpus sit, nimirum quod e Mariâ virgine natum est, quod passum est et quod mortuum est et quod resurrexit...Si tantum potest vox consequi ut omnes aures impleat... cur hoc non possit multo efficacius et potentius Christus efficere Suo corpore? Quanto præstantior et illuminatiores res est corpus glorificatum voce corporeâ?... Præterea ego evangelium de Christo prædico, et voce quidem corporeâ Christum in cor tibi adduco.... Quare qui hoc fide potest assequi... neque illud grave et arduum est creditu, corpus et sanguinem Christi esse in sacramento... Ratione incomprehensibile est, quo pacto Christus corpus et sanguinem Suum pani et vino immittat... His dictis panem consecrantes nihil addubitamus Illum certe adesse... Quemadmodum in cor pervenire solet nullo facto foramine, verum, tantum audito verbo, animo comprehenditur, ita quoque in panem immigrat ut non opus sit Illum facto foramine perfodiri...Quid autem sit Christum ad cœlos ascendere? Persuasio arripienda Illum esse super omnes creaturas et in omnibus et extra omnes...neque enim opus est ut verbis, quæ dicuntur, cœlitus detrahatur in panem ..nam

where in all creatures, in flint, in fire, in waters, &c. [Luther seems to forget that the question at issue is not whether Christ's Divinity is everywhere, but whether His humanity, and therefore His body, is here and in heaven at once.] He is indeed everywhere in all things. But He is most of all present by His own word; although even in this mode He is not so near at hand as here in the sacrament, by which He exhibits His own flesh and blood, tied fast in the bread and wine, to be eaten by them that believe. Be this my wall of brass, that Christ both can do and does all these things by His word. You have here the sum of Christian doctrine put forth, p. 362.

Vol. II. 261. "Drink ye all of it." "I too might here like to trifle easily and to mock with my words the [sacred] words of Christ, as my opponent trifles with them. But by the Scriptures must they be refuted when they lean on the Scriptures against us. It is these very words that have prevented my condemning the Bohemians, who, be they bad or be they good, certainly have Christ's word and deed on their side. But we have neither, but only that empty fiction, 'The church has ordained it so,' when it is not the church that has ordained them, but the tyrants over churches, while the church's *i. e.* the people of God's consent is on the other side. But I beseech you what necessity was there for it? What scruple had arisen? What benefit could spring from it? To deny to laymen both kinds, *i. e.* to deny them the visible sign (of both), when all allow that they have the reality of the sacrament without the sign. If they allow that laymen have the reality, which is the greater of the two, why concede they not the

nusquam non Christus in omnibus creaturis, in silice in igne in aquis, &c. ... Est quidem passim in omnibus rebus. Et vero verbo Suo præsentissimus: etsi per hunc modum ita non sit præsto ut hic in sacramento, per quod carnem et sanguinem Suum, in pane et vino alligatum, credentibus manducandum exhibet. Hic murus aheneus esto, Christum hæc omnia per verbum et posse et facere. Hic Christianæ doctrinæ summam habes propositam, p. 362.

*Opera, Jena, 1581, Vol. II. p. 261. De Cap. Bab. Ecc. anno XX.*  
*Bibite ex eo omnes.*

Vellem et hic nugari facile et verbis meis illudere verba Christi, ut meus nugator facit. Sed Scripturis redarguendi sunt, qui Scripturis nituntur contra nos. Hæc sunt quæ me prohibuerunt Bohemos damnare, qui sive sint mali sive boni, certe verbum et factum Christi habent pro se. Nos autem neutrum, sed tantum inane illud hominum commentum, Ecclesia sic ordinavit; cum non ecclesia, sed tyranni ecclesiarum, citra consensum ecclesiæ, *i. e.* populi Dei, ista ordinarint. Obsecro autem quæ sit necessitas? quæ religio? quæ utilitas? laicis negare utramque speciem, *i. e.* signum visibile, quando omnes concedunt eis rem sacramenti sine signo? Si rem concedunt, quæ major est, cur signum quod minus est

sign, which is the less thing of the two? [P. 263.] The holy Cardinal Camera formerly gave me cause for reflexion, when I was drinking in scholastic philosophy, disputing most acutely on the fourth book of the Sentences: saying that it is much more probable, and that less superfluous miracle would require to be assumed, if there were on the altar true bread and true wine, and if no theory of accidents only had to be raised, but then the church had determined the contrary. [Was not this Camera's veiled irony, like Gerson's?] Afterwards when I saw what church it was, viz. that which was guided by Thomas Aquinas, i.e. by Aristotle, which had determined this, I became bolder.... That there is (that is to say) true bread and true wine, and that in it Christ's true flesh and true blood are (present), no otherwise and no less than they are declared to be under their own assumed accidents. [His consecration is the presence both of the flesh and blood entire and of the bread and wine entire.] [P. 264.] If therefore transubstantiation is to be laid down, to prevent the body of Christ being truly said of bread, why is not transaccidentation laid down to prevent Christ's body being truly predicated of one of its accidents? Does not Christ seem admirably to have met this disposition to enquire when He said not concerning the wine, 'This thing' (neuter) is My blood, but This (masc.) is my blood.' [The Greek word is neuter: and so is the Greek word for blood.] The third captivity of the same sacrament is that which is that most impious abuse of all, by which it has come to pass that there is hardly anything that is at this day more generally received in the church or of which men are more persuaded than that the Mass is a meritorious (good) work and a sacrifice. And this abuse has let

---

non concedunt? P. 263. Dedit mihi quondam, cum theologiam scholasticam haurirem, occasionem cogitandi D. Cardinalis Camera, libro sententiarum quarto acutissime disputans: multo probabilius esse et minus superfluum miraculorum, si in altari verus panis verumque vinum, non autem sola accidentia astruerentur, nisi ecclesia determinasset contrarium. Postea videns quæ sit ecclesia quæ hoc determinasset, nempe Thomistica, hoc est, Aristotelica, audacior factus sum... Esse videlicet verum panem verumque vinum, in quibus Christi vera caro verusque sanguis non aliter nec minus sit quam illi sub accidentibus suis ponunt. P. 264. Si ideo est transubstantiatio ponenda ne corpus Christi de pane verificetur, cur non etiam ponitur transaccidentatio ne corpus Christi de accidente verificetur. [See passage in Hen. VIII.] Nonne Christus videtur huic curiositati pulchre occurrisse cum non de vino dixerit, Hoc est sanguis meus, sed Hic est sanguis meus [where the Greek is Τοῦτο]. Tertia captivitas ejusdem sacramenti est longe impiissimus ille abusus, quo factum est ut fere nihil sit hodie in ecclesiâ receptius ac magis persuasum, quam missam esse opus bonum et sacrificium. Qui abusus deinde inundavit

in an infinite flood of other abuses, until faith has wholly died out of the sacrament, and men have made out of the sacrament of God mere fairs, and entertainments and a kind of agreements for making money. This is how associations, brotherhoods, suffrages, merits, anniversaries, commemorations and that kind of matters are sold in church, bought, bargained for, and got up, and the whole living of the priests and of the monks is brought to depend on such transactions. I attempt a business that is difficult and that perhaps may prove impossible to be torn up by the roots, since it is one that has been confirmed by the custom of so many ages and by general consent, and thus has so settled down that the greater part of the books that at this day are supreme and almost the entire face of the churches must be taken away and changed, and an entirely different kind of ceremonies must be brought in or rather brought back. But my Christ is living, and we are to treat the word of God with more respect than the understandings of all men or even angels. Therefore I will do my part, &c., &c.

P. 263. "And when you shall frequent the supper be mindful of Me. Preach of this My great love and bounty towards thee and praise Me and give thanks.... But at this time how small a part of men knows that the Mass is Christ's promise—not to speak of those impious reciters of fables, that teach men's traditions instead of Christ's great promise.... We are not to do many works and to bring them to God, but to believe all and to receive all that are there promised to us.... It is therefore right to say that the whole virtue of the mass consists in the words in

---

*infinitos alios abusos, donec fide sacramenti penitus extinctâ, meras nundinas cauponationes et questuarios quosdam contractus e Divino sacramento fecerint. Hinc participationes fraternitates suffragia merita anniversaria memoriæ et id genus negotiorum in ecclesiâ venduntur emuntur paciscuntur componuntur, pendetque in his universa alimonia sacerdotum et monachorum. Rem arduam et quam [quæ] forte sit impossibile convelli aggredior [Luther had read Tacitus], ut quæ, tanto sæculorum usu firmata omniumque consensu probata, sic insederit ut necesse sit majorem partem librorum qui hodie regnant, et pæne universarum ecclesiarum faciem tolli et mutari, penitusque aliud genus cæremoniarum induci seu potius reduci. Sed Christus meus vivit, et majori curâ verbum Dei oportet observare quam omnium hominum et angelorum intelligentias. Ergo meâ vice fungar.*

P. 263.

Quod cum frequentaveris Mei memor sis. Hanc meam in te charitatem et largitatem prædices et laudes et gratias agas... At nunc quanta pars novit missam esse promissionem Christi? ut taceam impios fabulatores qui humanas traditiones vice tantæ promissionis docent... Non multa operari et afferre sed omnia credere et accipere quæ tibi illic promittuntur... Recte itaque dicis totam virtutem missæ consistere

which Christ testifies that forgiveness of sins is given to all them that believe.

P. 268. "Now another stumblingblock too must be removed which is both much greater and most specious. It is that the mass is everywhere believed to be a sacrifice that is offered to God. And to this opinion the words of the Rule of the mass are consonant, when it is said 'these gifts, these contributions, these 'holy sacrifices.' And further on, 'This offering.' It is also most clearly entreated that the sacrifice may be accepted, like as Abel's sacrifice, &c. Thence too Christ is called 'the host (victim) of the 'altar.' Added to this there are the sayings of the holy fathers, such a band of examples of it, and a church custom of constant observance through the world. We ought most constantly to set in opposition to these things, which have most perseveringly settled down, Christ's example and Christ's words. For till we shall have won an acknowledgment that the mass is Christ's promise and testament (will), as is the plain meaning of the words, we have lost our whole gospel and all our comfort. Let us not permit anything to become prevalent that is contrary to these words, were an angel from heaven to teach differently. For those words contain nothing about a meritorious work or about a sacrifice. Thus Christ's example is on our side. For Christ in His last supper, when He was instituting this sacrament and arranging this His will, did not offer Himself to God the Father, nor did He perform it as a good work for others, but sitting at the table He propounded the same testament for each one and exhibited the

*in verbis Christi quibus testatur remissionem peccatorum donari omnibus qui credunt, &c.*

*P. 268.*

*Jam et alterum scandalum amovendum est, quod multo grandius est et speciosissimum. Id est quod missa creditur passim esse sacrificium quod offertur Deo ; in quam opinionem et verba Canonis sonare videntur, ubi dicitur, Hæc dona, hæc munera, hæc sancta sacrificia. Et infra, Hanc oblationem. Item clarissime postulatur, ut acceptum sit sacrificium sicut sacrificium Habel, &c. Inde Christus hostia altaris dicitur. Accedunt his dicta S. patrum, tot exempla tantusque usus per orbem constanter observatus. His omnibus, quæ pertinacissime insederunt, oportet constantissime opponere verba et exemplum Christi. Nisi enim missam obtinuerimus esse promissionem Christi seu testamentum, ut verba clare sonant, totum evangelium et universum solatium amittimus. Nihil contra hæc verba permittamus prævalere, etiamsi angelus de cælo aliud docuerit. Nihil enim de opere vel sacrificio in illis continetur. Deinde exemplum Christi pro nobis stat. Non enim Christus in cenâ novissimâ, cum institueret hoc sacramentum et conderet testamentum, Ipsum obtulit Deo Patri, aut ut opus bonum pro aliis perfecit ; sed in mensâ sedens singulis idem testamentum proposuit et signum exhibuit.*

sign of it. Now the nearer and the more like a modern mass is to the first mass of all, which Christ performed at the supper, so much the more Christian is it. But Christ's mass was most simple, without any point of vestments and singing and other ceremonies; but if it had been necessary that it should be offered as a sacrifice, would He not then have completely instituted it as such? [P. 269.] It is a safer course to deny everything about the mass than to concede that it is a (meritorious) work [in itself] or a sacrifice, for fear we should deny Christ's word and corrupt faith and the mass too. Faith alone is peace for the conscience."

---

*Jam missa quanto vicinior et similior primæ omnium missæ quam Christus in cœnâ fecit, tanto Christianior. At missa Christi fuit simplicissima, sine ullâ vestium cantuum aliarumque cæremoniarum pompâ; ubi, si necesse fuisset eam offerri ut sacrificium, non plene eam instituisset? P. 269. Tutius est omnia negare quam missam concedere opus aut sacrificium esse, ne verbum Christi negemus, fidem simul cum missâ pessundantes... Fides sola est pax conscientiæ.*

(D.) KING HENRY VIII. OF ENGLAND. B. 1491. D. 1546.

(E.) AND BISHOP JOHN FISHER OF ROCHESTER. B. 1459. D. 1535.

Bishop Fisher was both born and educated at Beverley, the lighter architecture of whose Minster rivals the more masculine strength of York Cathedral, which divides with Durham the glory of being the noblest of English houses of prayer. Attached to the suite of Lady Margaret, Countess of Richmond and mother of Henry VII., he became the first professor on her foundation at Cambridge and President of Queens' College. He rose to his bishopric in 1504 and had the high moral honour of subsequently refusing richer bishoprics. It is not unlikely that Henry VIII. in writing his book in defence of the Seven Sacraments against Luther supplied any weak points in his own learning from the bishop's wider reading; but that the book is Henry's own rests on internal evidence contained in Fisher's own acknowledged defence of the king in Fisher's treatise against Luther's noble "Babylonian Captivity." Ulrich Valene then raised the point that St Peter was never at Rome. Fisher had already shewn himself above the temptations of money; he alas! soon felt himself obliged not only to protest against the divorce of Catherine by the king and against

the Act that confirmed the succession in Queen Anne, but also to oppose the king's supremacy. He came also under suspicion of treason in the matter of the Nun of Kent and was imprisoned in the Tower; and it is recorded that when the pope in reward of his fidelity offered him a cardinal's hat, the king exclaimed with one of the profane oaths of the time, "He shall wear it on his shoulders then, for I will leave him never a head to set it on." Accordingly he was visited in London's fortress and entrapped into an express denial of the Royal Supremacy, and then condemned and executed like Sir Thomas More for the same crime on Tower Hill: and his sacred person was subjected to gross indignities, that marked what barbarism was yet lingering in England. His papers too were seized and burned; but enough remained to fill one folio volume, which appeared sixty years later, not in England but on the Continent. But a member of St John's, Cambridge, has commemorated the benefactions of Lady Margaret, by putting forth Bishop Fisher's funeral sermon preached at her decease, and annexing lists of the professors and preachers on her foundations at Oxford as well as at Cambridge. But his biographer is John Lewis, in two vols. London, 1855; who calls Baily's life of him, published two hundred years earlier, "a short and partial memoir." Let Fisher have his place among those worthies of England in past ages, who did not attain to Reformation light.

*Assertion of the Seven Sacraments against M. Luther.*

[Luther says in his reply, "I have heard through witnesses worthy of credit that the book published with Thy Majesty's name is not the king's."] P. 12. "When Ambrose says that there is nothing else but flesh and blood, he openly contradicts Luther, who says that there is bread together with flesh and wine together with blood. [P. 14.] If he brings back that thing to the

---

*Henry VIII. of England's Assertio Septem Sacramentorum adversus Mart. Lutherum*, Paris, 1562; of which Luther says in his reply to the King, "Fide dignis testibus didici libellum sub Majestatis Tuae nomine editum non esse Regis Angliæ," &c.; attributed by some to Fisher, Bp. of Rochester.

*P. 12 a.*

Quum Ambrosius dicat nihil esse aliud quam carnem et sanguinem, aperte contradicit Luthero, qui simul cum carne dicit esse panem, et simul cum sanguine vinum. P. 14 b. Si eam rem ad exactam evan-

exact form approved by evangelic reason and does not allow any authority to the church, why does he not command the eucharist to be always received during supper, yea even after supper? [P. 15.] If the entire church's custom does not make a thing right, so that the form (species) of wine may be omitted in the case of laity, by what authority does Luther dare to put water into the wine? [See Durand de St Porcian for arguments against it.]... On this point Luther makes some prating against us. I certainly think it safer to believe that the laity are rightly communicated in either kind alone, than that the whole clergy, as he disputes, through all ages have been for this one cause in damnation. [P. 19.] A thing which Luther sharply argues, yea trifles in...when Christ says regarding the wine, not 'This thing is My blood,' but 'This is My blood' [as in the Vulgate.]... Christ would appear to have been more on their side, if He had said, 'This thing is My blood.' [This slip shews how unsafe it is not to know Greek.]

P. 40. "Next Luther teaches that the bread and the wine, which the ancients confess to be converted into the Lord's body and blood, still remain unchanged, so that in order he by degrees passes over the honour from Christ into the bread. Then though he does not condemn the church for having adorned and amplified the mass with rites and ceremonies, yet he thinks that the mass would be much more Christian if the pomp of all the vestments, singings, gestures and other ceremonies should be taken away, so

gelicæ rationis formam revocat neque quicquam prorsus permittit ecclesiæ, cur eucharistiam non jubet semper in cœnâ recipi, imo vero post cœnam? P. 15. Si totius ecclesiæ consuetudo rectum non facit, ut in laicis omittatur species vini, quâ ratione aquam in vinum audet Lutherus infundere? [See Buxtorf, de S. J. From his account it is doubtful whether the Jews put water into the wine at the passover.] Quâ de re Lutherus aliquid obgannit. Ego certe tutius opinor credere laicos recte sub alterâ tantum specie communicatos quam per tota secula totum clerum, quod iste disputat, hac unâ de causâ fuisse damnatum. P. 19 b. Quod argutatur, imo nugatur Lutherus...quum de vino dicit Christus non, Hoc est sanguis Meus, sed, Hic est sanguis Meus... Videretur magis pro eo fecisse si dixisset Christus, Hoc est sanguis Meus. [The king quotes the Vulgate rightly, Mark xiv. 22, but the Greek has τοῦτο.]

P. 40 b.

Deinde panem et vinum, quæ veteres conversâ fatentur in corpus et sanguinem Domini, Lutherus adhuc manere docet integra, ut ordine paulatim honorem a Christo traducat in panem. Tum, licet non damnat ecclesiam, quæ ritibus et cæremoniis ornavit et ampliavit missam, tamen censet quod foret missa multo Christianior, si vestium cantuum gestuum et cæterarum cæremoniarum omnium pompa tolle-



that it might be nearer and more like the first mass of all which Christ celebrated in the supper with the apostles: yea even so that very little indeed may remain to stir the simple minds of the low people and by honouring with visible majesty turn them to commemorate the invisible Deity. On these points he teaches and by all means inculcates, that the mass is not a good work, that it is not a sacrifice, that it is not an oblation, &c. [P. 41.] Luther therefore, after he had taught a brief and compendium-like preparation for receiving the Lord's supper, *viz.* of faith only in the promise, with no good works, with the lightest searching of the conscience—lastly that there may be nothing lacking to absolute holiness in order to receive the eucharist, opens his own heart's wish, how often, and in what part of the year he for the most part wishes the people to be obliged to receive the communion, namely at no time at all. What then? What? Is any one so blind as not to see to what point these very vile things tend? Surely to nothing short of the people gradually revolting from the communion of the sacrament altogether, as they first took the downward path from daily communion to every seventh day, afterwards put it off longer, and at length seem about to come to an end altogether, &c., unless the fathers in fear of that very thing had sanctioned the law that every one should communicate thrice a year. [P. 42.] Luther may be able to gain his point that the mass shall be spoiled not only of its apparatus and ceremonies but also of the full attendance hope and veneration of the people. These then are those redoubtable promises of Luther.

---

*retur, ut esset vicinior et similior primæ omnium missæ quam Christus in cœnâ celebravit cum apostolis: immo vero ut quam minimum supersit eorum quæ simplices animos plebeculæ commoveat et in commemorationem numinis invisibilis visibilis honore majestatis convertat. Ad hæc docet et omnibus modis inculcat, missam bonum opus non esse, sacrificium non esse, oblationem non esse, &c. P. 41 a. Lutherus ergo, posteaquam præparationem istam docuit brevem et compendiarium ad suscipiendam eucharistiam nempe in solâ fide promissionis, nullis operibus bonis levissimâ disquisitione conscientiæ, postremo nequidquam desit absolutæ sanctimonie ad suscipiendam eucharistiam, suum votum aperit, quoties et quibus anni partibus potissimum velit cogi populum communionem sumere, nempe prorsus nullo. Quid ita? Quid? An quisquam tam cæcus est ut non videat quorsum hæc tam putida tendant? Certe non aliorum quam ut populus sensim a communione sacramenti desciscat in totum, qui primum a quotidianâ communione deflexit in septimum quemque diem, post in longius distulit, tandem destitutus videbitur omnino, nisi patres, illud veriti, sanxissent ut ter in anno quisque communicaret, &c. P. 42. Lutherus obtinere possit ut missa non apparatu tantum et cærimoniis sed populi quoque frequentia spe ac veneratione spoliatur. Hæc sunt ergo præclara illa promissa Lutheri.*

*Bishop Fisher's Defence of the Assertions of the King of England regarding the Catholic Church against Luther's 'Captivity in Babylon.'*

P. 39. "There is no doubt that many customs have been introduced by the Holy Spirit into the church, beyond what have been delivered to the Scripture to record and of which there is no mention in Scripture. Where the Scriptures are wanting, it will be sufficient that the practice was brought in by reason or custom. Among customs there is very great difference. If it be a bad one, it is now credible that it was introduced by a malignant spirit. But if on the other hand it should be holy and healthful, and from age to age approved by Christians, I in no respect doubt but that this was inspired by the Holy Spirit.

P. 68. "In this matter the most holy and most learned martyr Cyprian affirms that it had been enjoined by God's inspiration and commandment, that we should not offer the cup with water only, or with wine only, but mingled with wine. Next he asserts that Christ did that very thing in the supper, which he confirms out of Scripture and chiefly from Solomon's Proverbs, ix. 'Wisdom hath builded a house for herself, and mingled her wine in the cup.' [See Henry VIII.'s writing on this and the reference there. This, excusable in Cyprian at the third century, should hardly have satisfied an English bishop even in the first half of the sixteenth century.]

*Bp. Fisher's Assertionum Regis Angliæ de fide Catholica, adversus Lutheri Babylon. Capt., defensio. Paris, 1562.*

P. 39 a.

Multas non est dubium a Spiritu Sancto consuetudines introductas in ecclesiam fuisse; citra quam Scripturæ nobis traditæ fuerunt, de quibus in scripturis nulla fit mentio...ubi Scripturæ desunt, illic aut rationem aut consuetudinem attulisse sufficiet... Inter consuetudines plurimum interest... Si prava sit, jam credibile est eam a maligno spiritu fuisse introductam. Sin contra sancta salutarisque fuerit et generatim ab omnibus approbata Christianis, hanc ego nihil ambigo quin a Spiritu sancto fuisset inspirata.

P. 68.

Hic sanctissimus et doctissimus martyr (Cyprianus) a Deo sibi inspirante et mandante fuisse præceptum affirmat, ut calicem non aquâ solâ nec vino solo sed vino mixtum offeramus. Deinde Christum id ipsum asserit in cenâ fecisse; quod et postea ex scripturis confirmat et potissimum ex Salomone, Prov. viii., Sapientia ædificavit sibi domum ...miscuit in cratere vinum suum.

P. 75. "He said, 'This is My body': not 'This is bread,' as Luther interprets it. For in the mean time, after He had received the bread and before He had handed it to His apostles to eat, He converted it into His own body: so that the apostles did not now receive bread but the body of Christ, into which the bread had been previously converted. If that bread had remained bread and had not been changed into Christ's body, Christ would have said, 'This (masc.) is My body,' that the pronoun might be of the same gender as bread, &c.

[King Henry had used a wrong term "Creative substance," or it might be rendered "Creator substance;" Fisher advances to defend him, p. 100.] "But because Luther by the example of ignited iron contended that the substance of bread can remain with Christ's body, *the king* with that fervour of faith which he has towards the most sacred body of Christ added somewhat. He said, 'Whoever thinks of the most blessed body of Christ as he ought, will more easily assent that any two bodies can remain joined together, than that another body should remain with the venerated body of Christ.' For neither is any substance worthy to be mingled with that substance, which has founded (created) all substances. Nor does *the king* here mean by creative substance the flesh of Christ to be understood, as Luther in many words afterwards nonsensically talks; but *the king* means (by this) Christ Himself who created all things."

P. 75 a.

Dixit, Hoc est corpus Meum: non hic panis, ut Lutherus interpretatur. Nam interea postquam acceperat panem et antequam apostolis ad edendum porrexerat, convertit ipsum in Suum corpus: ut jam non panem acceperint apostoli, sed Christi corpus, in quod fuerit panis ante conversus. Si panis iste mansisset panis, nec mutatus fuisset in Christi corpus, dixisset Christus, Hic est corpus Meum, ut esset pronomen ejusdem generis, cujus erat et panis, &c. [The answer is the old usage in Greek of writing under pictures not Τοῦτο δένδρον only under a tree, but under a horse Τοῦτο ἵππος, &c.]

The King seems to have used the words "creatix substantia:" so Fisher writes, p. 100 a. Cæterum quia Lutherus contendit hoc exemplo (igniti ferri) manere posse substantiam panis una cum corpore Christi, rex, ex fervore fidei quam habet erga sacratissimum Christi corpus, nonnihil adjecit. Quisquis [inquit] beatissimum Christi corpus sic ut debet existimat, facilius assentietur quascunque duas substantias simul manere conjunctas, quam ullum corpus aliud manere cum venerando corpore Christi. Neque enim ulla substantia digna est, quæ cum eâ misceatur substantiâ, quæ substantias omnes condidit. Neque hic per "creatricem substantiam" rex carnem Christi vult intelligi, quemadmodum Lutherus multis verbis postea blaterat, sed ipsum Christum qui cuncta creavit.

It is plain that the king had slipped in using the word *caro* with *creatrix*: and if the bishop wished to maintain that a king cannot argue wrong, he should have looked more closely after the king's original treatise. But it is of use, for if Fisher was incapable of such a slip, the king himself and not Bishop John Fisher wrote the first treatise.

(F.) PHILIP MELANCHTHON (SCHWARTZERDT). B. 1497.

D. 1560.

There were deficiencies in the character of his mind: but no one can read such modern volumes as those of Archdeacon Hare and D'Aubigné without seeing that in the German Reformation this doctor, born at little Bretten in the Palatinate, held the rudder that directed its course. Witness the keeping of Luther at a distance, praying in his solitude four hours each day, while Melanchthon and others fought hand to hand at Augsburg with the great powers and men of learning on the Roman side. But, if Melanchthon "helmed the business," Luther was the mighty steam-power, which, under God, forced the noble vessel on. And most pleasant it is to see how Luther from first to last loved and appreciated this wonderful man, calling him "his dear Philip." That he did not diverge and that the great movement itself did not diverge from straight-forward Bible truth in successively adopting the various forms in which the doctrine of the Lord's supper was presented by Melanchthon's ready pen, in the heart of the conflict, who shall venture to affirm? The marvel is that the wrong words that crept in were so few.

His name was probably given him after a German prince, to whom his father was chief gentleman-at-arms. When he was paying a visit to his mother in his 32nd year she in the simplicity of her piety asked him what to believe out of the various discussions that seemed to her so new and strange, and his reply was that, with simple belief and fervent prayer like hers, she would beyond all question be saved. He learned Latin from a John of Hungary and Greek from George Semler. He left the University of Heidelberg at fifteen for Tübingen, to be near to Reuchlin at Stuttgart. He had published several classical works and had refused many attractive posts, when he became professor of lan-

guages at Wittenberg at twenty-one years of age. In a year he was engaged on Luther's side in a struggle with Eck and became professor of theology. In three years his *Loci Communes* appeared. At twenty-seven he vainly endeavoured to conciliate Erasmus and Luther. The opinions of the unlucky Carlstadt on this sacrament and the horrible war of the peasants vexed his quiet spirit. But the latter he thought arose from too much liberty. From his appearance at Spires in 1529 his movements and almost his words are German church history, and many of them form part of the history of the universal church, till he was laid at the side of Luther in the churchyard at Wittenberg.

P. 257. "But when Luke and Paul say, 'This is the cup of the New Testament,' it is, so to speak, the figure metonymy: as if I were to say, the fasces of the Roman empire. Afterward consideration is very necessary to see why express mention is here made of the New Testament, and particularly in that part of the narration where the blood is mentioned. A testament is a promise of one that is about to die. Therefore this word has been used concerning the promise of the Son of God giving His benefits, that His coming death might be signified, as it has been written (by Paul) to the Hebrews. The New Testament is a promise of eternal good things—of remission of sins, of the Holy Spirit, of righteousness and of life eternal, which are freely supplied through the Messiah, not through the law.... Know certainly that eternal good things are supplied on account of the blood of the Son of God shed in His own death. No man's work earns those eternal good things left to us for the Son's death. This rite [of the supper] is not then a sacrifice to earn these good

*On 1 Corinthians XI. Vol. IV. p. 257. Wittenberg, 1601.*

Cum autem Lucas et Paulus dicunt, Hoc est calix novi Testamenti, *μετονομία* est, ut ita dicam; ut si dicam, Fasces sunt imperium Romanum. Deinde valde necessaria est consideratio cur hic expresse facta sit mentio Novi Testamenti, et quidem in eâ narratione ubi fit mentio sanguinis. Testamentum est promissio morituri. Ideo usurpata est hæc vox de promissione Filii Dei donantis Sua beneficia, ut significaretur ventura mors, sicut ad Hebræos scriptum est. Novum Testamentum est promissio bonorum æternorum—remissionis peccatorum, Spiritus sancti, justitiæ et vitæ æternæ, quæ propter Messiam gratis exhibentur, non propter legem.... Scias certo exhiberi bona æterna propter sanguinem Filii Dei effusam in Ipsius morte. Non opus ullius hominis meretur illa æterna bona legata propter Filii mortem. Non igitur hic ritus sacrificium est quod mereatur facienti et aliis hæc bona,

things for him that offereth it and for others [for whom he offers it], but it testifies that they are furnished to us, and they must be received by faith, that leans on the sacrifice of the Son of God Himself, not on any merits of ours. This most expansive doctrine has been comprehended in this appellation of the New Testament, which here we cannot embrace entire. I only briefly admonish you that the fountain-head of this doctrine must be searched out as often as we think on the supper of the Lord and as often as we approach to it. This is a manifest refutation of sacrificers and of Anabaptism, since it is the rite of a new promise, which is free; it is not a sacrifice to earn this for others. Also since it is a rite of the New Testament that the things left to us by the Son may be supplied to us, it testifies and is a pledge of God's will towards us; not only a ceremony signifying love to one another as the Anabaptists say. It is also a notable detail that Christ orders that this rite be observed until He come.... That God will ever preserve the church in this life until the resurrection of the dead, even a public ministration of the sacraments, public assemblies, and some hospitalities of churches. These sweet consolations are contained in this brief detail. ...

*Augsburg Confession*, 1530. P. 48. "Perhaps the mutilation of the ceremony [by giving the bread only to the laity] was a sign that the gospel had become obscured in relation to the blood of Christ: i. e. concerning the benefits of His death.

P. 46. "Nor does anything from the beginning of the world

sed testatur ea exhiberi et fide ea accipi oportet, quæ nititur Ipsius Filii Dei sacrificio non ullis nostris meritis. Hæc amplissima doctrina comprehensa est in hac appellatione Novi Testamenti, quam hic integram complecti non possumus. Tantum breviter admoneo hujus doctrinæ fontes requirendos esse, quoties de cenâ Domini cogitamus et quoties ad eam accidimus. Manifesta refutatio est sacrificiorum et Anabaptismi: cum sit ritus novæ promissionis quæ est gratuita, non est sacrificium quod aliis mereatur. Item, cum est ritus Novi Testamenti nobis exhiberi legata a Filio, testatur et pignus est voluntatis Dei erga nos; non tantum est cæremonia mutus dilectionis ut Anabaptistæ dicunt. Est et hæc particula insignis quod hunc ritum servari jubet Christus "donec venerit"... Deum semper in hac vitâ usque ad resurrectionem mortuorum servaturum esse ecclesiam, publicum ministerium sacramentorum publicos congressus et aliqua ecclesiarum hospitalia. Hæ dulces consolationes in hac brevi particulâ continentur.

*Augsburg Confession*, 1530, p. 48. *On denying the cup to the Laity.*

Fortassis cæremoniæ mutilatio significavit obscuratum esse evangelium de sanguine Christi, h. e. de beneficiis mortis Christi.

P. 46.

Nec videtur ulla res ab initio mundi adeo vulgo ad quæstum

appear to have been so commonly made to bring in money, as the mass. And perhaps it is for this reason that the church is specially punished in these last days by blindness, by discords, by wars and by many other plagues.... The opinion of their abuse is dispersed in the church. Men interpret it as a sacrifice, that is, a work, which, used for others, merits for them the remission of their fault and punishments, and that simply by the work being done without any good emotion on the part of him that uses it. They so interpret it that an oblation is made by the priest in the mass for the living and the dead. Then it was enquired whether one mass said for several does them as much good as one for each. This disputation augmented to an infinite amount both the number and the gain from the masses. It is not possible to obtain remission of sins on account of another man's work, and indeed without a good movement of the heart, *i. e.* without faith of one's own. This reason clearly enough refutes that monstrous and impious opinion of the merit and application of the mass. [P. 47.] A satisfaction was made once for all for the sins of all by the sacrifice of Christ. This honour of Christ's sacrifice ought not to be transferred to a priest's work. For (Paul) says eloquently 'that by one oblation the saints have been perfected.' In these things it is impious to transfer to a priest's work what ought to rest on the oblation itself and on the intercession of Christ the High-Priest. Much more absurd is it that the mass is given to free the souls of the dead. For the mass was instituted for remembrance, &c., &c. Nor is the mass a satisfaction for punishment, but it was instituted for the remission of faults, *i. e.* not to

---

collata esse ac missa. Et fortassis propter eam causam præcipue plebitur ecclesia his postremis temporibus, cæcitate, discordiis, bellis et aliis multis pestibus... Abusus opinio est sparsa in ecclesiâ. Interpretantur sacrificium, opus videlicet quod, applicatum pro aliis, meretur eis remissionem culpæ et pœnarum, idque ex opere operato sine bono motu utentis. Sic interpretantur oblationem a sacerdote in missâ fieri pro vivis et mortuis. Deinde quærebatur utrum una missa dicta pro pluribus tantum prosit quantum singulæ pro singulis. Hæc disputatio et numerum missarum et quæstum in infinitum auxit. Impossibile est consequi remissionem peccatorum propter alienum opus et quidem sine bono motu, *i. e.* sine fide propriâ. Hæc ratio satis clare refutat illam prodigiosam et impiam opinionem de merito et applicatione missæ. P. 47. Christi sacrificio semel satisfactum esse pro omnium peccatis. Hic honos sacrificii Christi non debet transferri in opus sacerdotis. Diserte enim dicit (Paulus), Unâ oblatione sanctos consummatos esse. Ad hæc impium est, quæ niti debent ipsâ Pontificis Christi oblatione et intercessionem, transferre in opus sacerdotis. Multo absurdius est quod missa confertur ad liberandas animas mortuorum. Nam missa instituta est ad recordationem, &c. &c. Nec missa est satisfactio pro pœnâ sed instituta est propter remissionem culpæ, videlicet non ut

be a satisfaction for a fault, but to be a sacrament, by the use of which we may be admonished of Christ's benefit and the remission of our faults. A ceremony without faith in the New Testament earns nothing for him that performs it, nor for others. By one's own faith the application of the benefit of Christ takes place.... And this application of it is made freely. Therefore the application is not made by another man's work, nor on account of another man's work.... The institution of the sacrament is at war with that abuse; for no injunction is given about an oblation for sins of the living and the dead: but it is enjoined that the body and blood of the Lord should be received: and that that should be done for the remembrance of the benefit by Christ. For a remembrance signifies not only some representation of an historical fact, as if it were seen in a spectacle, as they dream who defend merit from the mere doing of the thing, but it signifies by faith to remember the promise and the benefit, to comfort the conscience and to give thanks for so great a benefit. For the principal cause of instituting it is that faith may there be stimulated and exercised when we receive this pledge of grace.... These arguments and many other testify, &c. Never, most excellent emperor, did a greater cause come up in the church, nor more worthy of the diligent deliberations of honest and good men. All pious men ought to beg of God that the church may be delivered from these sins. All kings and bishops ought to strive with all their power, that by a true explanation of this whole matter the church may be made clean again.... Pious assemblings are added. Men are diligently taught...for what use the sacrament is used.

---

sit satisfactio pro culpâ, sed ut sit sacramentum, quo utentes admonemur beneficii Christi et remissionis culpæ. Cæremonia sine fide in Novo Testamento nihil meretur facienti nec aliis. Fide propriâ fit applicatio beneficii Christi... Et hæc applicatio fit gratis. Ergo non fit applicatio alieno opere nec propter alienum opus... Institutio sacramenti pugnat cum illo abusu; nihil enim de oblatione pro peccatis vivorum et mortuorum præcipitur: sed præcipitur ut sumantur corpus et sanguis Domini: et ut id fiat ad recordationem beneficii Christi. Recordatio enim significat non aliquam tantum in historiâ repræsentationem, velut in spectaculo, sicut somniant illi qui defendunt meritum ex opere operato, sed significat fide recordari promissionem et beneficium, consolari conscientiam, et gratias agere pro tanto beneficio. Principalis enim causa institutionis est ut fides ibi excitetur et exerceatur, cum hoc pignus gratiæ accipimus... Hæc argumenta et pleraque alia testantur, &c. &c. ... Nunquam gravior causa, optime imperator, in ecclesiâ incidit, aut dignior de quâ docti et boni viri diligenter deliberent. Omnes hi a Deo petere debent ut his peccatis ecclesia liberetur. Reges omnes et episcopi omni studio anniti debent, ut hac totâ causâ explicatâ repurgetur ecclesia... Adduntur conciones piæ. Diligenter docentur homines ... Ad quem usum fit sacramentum.



P. 46. "When such worship is offered in the use of ceremonies the using of the sacrament is pleasing to God, the mass fully and piously used among us, and all things are being carried on in the church with greater gravity and reverence than formerly. Hitherto the bishops have not only tolerated manifest abuses, when they could not be ignorant of them, but have even sweetly smiled at them.

P. 108. "St Francis determined aright, when he appointed that every college should be content with a single mass daily. This was afterwards changed (in the Franciscan body) either from superstition or for the sake of gain. [From the Apology at Worms.]

*Saxon Confession*, (1551), Vol. i. 134. "All are ingrafted in the church by baptism, but the Lord wished the Lord's supper to be the strength of the public congregation..... Men are taught that sacraments are actions Divinely instituted and that beyond the instituted use the things themselves have not the reason for the sacrament; but that in the instituted use Christ is truly present in His substance and that Christ's body and blood are truly supplied in this communion (given) to the receivers. [If so, why all the vast fracas of the Reformation?...] The Son of God wishes this public receiving to be a confession to shew *what kind of doctrine* you embrace and to what assembly you unite yourself.... We openly condemn the portentous error of the

P. 46.

Cum hi cultus exercentur in usu cæremoniarum, placet Deo sacramenti usus, missa apud nos rite et pie, et geruntur omnia in ecclesiâ majore cum gravitate et reverentiâ quam olim... Manifestos abusos episcopi hactenus, cum quidem non ignorarent eos, non solum toleraverunt, sed suaviter etiam riserunt.

Vol. I. p. 108.

S. Franciscus recte voluit... qui constituit ut singula collegia quotidie unicâ communi missâ contenta essent. Hoc postea mutatum est, sive per superstitionem, sive quæstus causâ. [Apology at Worms, 1538.]

*Confession of the Saxon Churches, 1551, for Council of Trent.*

Vol. I. p. 134.

Per baptismum singuli inseruntur ecclesiâ; sed cœnam Domini voluit Dominus esse nervum publicæ congregationis... Docentur homines sacramenta esse actiones Divinitus institutas, et extra usum institutum res ipsas non habere rationem sacramenti: sed in usu instituto in hac communione *vere substantialiter adesse* Christum et vere exhiberi sumentibus corpus et sanguinem Christi, &c. &c. Vult (Filius Dei) hanc publicam sumptionem confessionem esse quâ ostendas quod doctrinæ genus amplectaris et cui cœtui te adjungas... Aperte damnamus portentosum errorem monachorum, qui scripserunt sumptionem

monks, who wrote that the reception earns the remission of sins, and indeed from the mere doing of the work without any good movement in the heart of the user of it. This imagination of the Pharisees is at war with Habakkuk's saying (c. ii.) 'the just shall live by his own faith.' We therefore thus instruct the church, that those who will approach to the supper of the Lord must bring with them penitence or conversion, and when faith has now been enkindled in thought upon the death and resurrection and benefits of the Son of God, they should piously seek (in this rite) a confirmation of this faith, &c. [P. 135.] With the whole heart we affirm before God and all the church that in heaven and earth there is one only propitiatory sacrifice, Heb. x.... And this sacrifice is applied to men, one by one, by their own faith, when they hear the gospel and use sacred rites.... Communion service set forth. That this rite...very much agrees with the apostles' writings and with the ancient church's custom nearly up to the time of Gregory [See the so-called Divine Liturgies! Then judge.] is known by all who are not wholly ignorant of antiquity. And since this is so, our churches' custom should be approved not blamed. It is a manifest profanation to carry about and adore a part of the Lord's supper (*i. e.* the bread). But we pray with real groanings, O High-priest of Thy church, to Thee, Son of God, Lord Jesus Christ, crucified for us and raised again, that for the sake of the glory of Thyself and the eternal Father Thou wouldest abolish (these) idols and errors and abominations, and, as Thou hast Thyself prayed, wouldest sanctify us in Thy truth, &c. The greatness of our sins surpasses the utterance of men and angels, which sins the profanation of the supper has in so many ages been producing.... They

---

*mereri remissionem peccatorum, et quidem ex opere operato sine bono motu utentis. Hæc Pharisaica imaginatio pugnat cum dicto Habacuc ii., Justus fide suâ vivet. Sic igitur erudimus ecclesiam accessuros ad cœnam Domini oportere pœnitentiam seu conversionem afferre, et accensâ jam fide in cogitatione de morte et resurrectione et beneficiis Filii Dei, quærere pie confirmationem hujus fidei, &c. P. 135. Toto pectore affirmamus coram Deo et totâ ecclesiâ in cœlo et in terrâ tantum fuisse unicum sacrificium propitiatorium, Heb. x.... Et hoc sacrificium singulis suâ fide applicatur cum audiunt evangelium et sacris utuntur. After description of Communion service, Hunc ritum... plurimum congruere cum scriptis apostolorum et cum consuetudine veteris ecclesiæ fere usque ad Gregorii ætatem, norunt omnes non prorsus ignari antiquitatis. Quod cum ita sit, probanda non improbanda nostrarum ecclesiarum consuetudo. Manifesta profanatio est partem cœnæ Domini circumgestare et adorare... Te autem, Fili Dei Domine Jesu Christe, crucifixe pro nobis et resuscitate, Summe Sacerdos ecclesiæ Tuæ, veris gemitibus oramus ut propter Tuam et æterni Patris gloriam deleas idola et errores et abominationes, et sic ut Ipse precatus es, sanctifices nos in veritate Tuâ, &c. Omnium hominum et angelorum eloquentiam superat magnitudo peccatorum, quæ profanatio cœnæ Domini tot jam*

know that [for the people] to be persuaded that it is a sacrifice is the very muscle of their power and wealth. This is why they refuse to hear a contrary opinion. The Son of God Himself offered Himself, entering into the holy of holies, *i.e.* into the secret council-chamber of the Divinity.... The custom of the ancient Greek and Latin church is well known. It must therefore be confessed that the forbidding of one part (of this sacrament) is unjust. To violate the legal testimonies of men is unjust. Why do the bishops violate the testament (will) of the Son of God sealed on its face with His own blood?... We commend the church itself and ourselves to the Son of God, &c., and we pray Him to direct us, and not to suffer the light of God's gospel to be extinguished, nor to suffer the assemblies of churches that truly call upon Him to be destroyed."

---

*sæculis parit...Has de sacrificio persuasiones sciunt nervos esse suæ potentiae et opum. Ideo contrariam orationem audire nolunt. Filius Dei Ipse Se obtulit, ingrediens in sanctum sanctorum, i.e. in arcanum concilium Divinitatis. Nota est consuetudo veteris ecclesiæ Latinæ et Græcæ. Ideo fatendum est unius partis prohibitionem injustam esse. Legitima hominum testamenta violare injustum est. Cur Filii Dei testamentum sanguine ejus obsignatum episcopi violent? The treatise ends, Commendamus ecclesiam ipsam et nos ipsos Filio Dei, &c. et Eum oramus ut nos regat, et non sinat extingui lucem evangelii Dei, nec deleri sinat cœtus Ipsum vere invocantes.*

(G.) HULDERIC ZWINGEL. B. JANUARY, 1484. D. 1531.

This is the way in which he writes his own name. In a collection of old Latin lives of six leading German and Swiss Reformers, published by Neander with etched portraits, Berlin, 1841, the autographs are set under the portraits. And under Zwingel's is written in very clear but rather separated letters Hulderic Zwingel von Einsidel, *i.e.* before he settled at Zurich. The portraits of Camerarius who wrote the Latin life of Melanchthon, and of Theodore Beza who wrote that of Calvin, are added but not their signatures. The Latin life of Luther which stands first is by Melanchthon. Zwingel's life is by Myconius. Luther's face is wearied but interesting: and Calvin's, which stands last, is more pleasant than usual; but Zwingel's is the common painful picture with a most deforming cap and an expression of severity and sadness like enough to his painful end, but very uncharacteristic of the geniality of his life till the last cloud fell on him.

So much will be said of him in Part III. that a few features of his life may suffice just now. His father was Landamman of the lofty agricultural region of Toggenburg. One of his earliest teachers was Lupulus (Wölflein) at Berne: but he returned to Basle to be under Wytttenbach: where and at other seats of learning he gained that high character as a classical scholar, which caused Erasmus to call him the first Latin orator of the day. In his early life he displayed great musical ability. Fuller says this. He spent some time at Einsiedlin, whose beautiful church well repays the traveller between Lucerne and Meyringen for diverging from his track to ascend that valley. But Zurich is Zwingel's seat, in which his power grew great: and till the fatal entanglement of Swiss policy, to which he fell a sacrifice, it seemed as if there were no prospective limits to the continually extending influence of the church of Zurich under his wise direction. The north of Italy was being added to the chief cantons of Switzerland in a noble league of pure and living democratic Protestantism, irrespective of the triumphs of monarchical Germany; and in some points the Swiss doctrine was of a superior cast: so that true freedom and pure religion never retreated from so sad a field as that Cappel, in the very neighbourhood of the city, where Zwingel fell, glad to die, a disappointed man.

P. 10. "If the presence and efficacy of grace have been tied to the sacraments, now where they are applied they work, and where they are not brought all things fade away. Nor is there any occasion for theologians to reason about material or subject-matter, because a disposition is required first, &c. For he that according to them receives that grace through the sacraments either prepares himself for this or is prepared by the Spirit. If he prepares himself, then we can do something of ourselves and prevenient grace is nothing. If he is prepared by the Spirit to receive grace, I ask whether this take place under the guidance of the sacra-

---

*Ad Carolum Imperatorem.* A.D. 1530. Vol. IV. p. 10. Zurich, 1836.

Si sacramentis alligata est gratiæ presentia et efficacia, jam quo adferuntur operantur, quo non adferuntur flaccescunt omnia. Nec est ut causentur materiam sive subjectum theologi (nostri), quod dispositio ante requiratur, &c. &c. Nam is qui istam per sacramenta gratiam recipit secundum ipsos, aut ipse seipsum ad hoc præparat aut a Spiritu præparatur. Si seipsum præparat, ergo et ex nobis aliquid possumus, et gratia præveniens nihil est. Si a Spiritu præparatur ad gratiæ acceptionem quæro an hoc etiam fit sacramento duce an extra sacramen-

ment or externally to the sacrament. If by the sacrament being the medium, then man is prepared for the sacrament by the sacrament, and thus there will be a series without limit, for always the sacrament will be required as a preparation for the sacrament. But if we are prepared before the sacrament for the receiving of sacramental grace, then the Spirit is present in his own benignity before the sacrament, and grace has equally been both produced and present before the sacrament is applied. From this it is clear (as in the sacramental matter I most willingly allow) that sacraments are given as a public pledge of His grace, which is present with each person by himself before. [This is amply sufficient to shew that Zwingel did not hold this sacrament to be a mere commemorative rite, but a way in which to obtain grace from God. But this shines in him everywhere.]

P. 11. "Believe therefore O Cæsar [Emperor Charles V.], that a sacrament is a sign of a sacred thing, *i.e.* of grace produced. I myself believe it the visible figure or form of invisible grace produced and given by the gift of God. I believe that in the sacred supper of the eucharist (*i.e.* of thanksgiving) the true body of Christ is present to a contemplating faith; *i.e.* that those who give thanks to God for so great a benefit conferred on us of His kindness in His own Son, recognize that He took to Him true flesh, suffered truly in it in that passion and truly washed away our sins with His own blood, and therefore that all that matter done by Christ is as it were present to them by a contemplating faith. But that Christ's body in its essence and reality (*i.e.* His natural body itself) is either present in the supper or is eaten by our mouth

tum. Si sacramento mediante, ergo sacramento paratur homo ad sacramentum et sic usque ad finem processus erit, nam semper ad sacramenti præparationem requiretur sacramentum. Si vero citra sacramentum præparamur ad sacramentalis gratiæ acceptionem, ergo Spiritus suâ benignitate adest ante sacramentum, et perinde gratia et facta et præsens est, antequam adferatur sacramentum. Ex quibus hoc colligitur (quod in re sacramentariâ volens ac libens admitto) sacramenta dari in testimonium publicum Ejus gratiæ, quæ cuique privato prius adest.

P. 11.

Crede igitur, O Cæsar, sacramentum esse, rei sacræ, hoc est factæ gratiæ, signum. Credo ipse invisibilis gratiæ, quæ scilicet Dei munere facta et data est, visibilem figuram sive formam. Credo in sacrâ eucharistiæ (hoc est gratiarum actionis) cœnâ *verum Christi corpus adesse* fidei contemplationi; hoc est, eos, qui gratias agunt Domino præ beneficio nobis in Filio Suo collato, agnoscere Illum *veram* carnem admisisse, *vere* in illâ passum esse, *vere* nostra peccata sanguine Suo abluisse, et sic omnem rem per Christum istam illis, fidei contemplatione, *velut præsentem* fieri. Sed quod Christi corpus *per essentiam et realiter* (hoc est corpus ipsum naturale) in cœnâ *aut adsit*, aut ore dentibusque nostris

and teeth (as the Papists, and those that look back to the flesh-pots of Egypt maintain), we truly not only deny that, but constantly insist that it is an error adverse to God's word.

P. 13. "On the reproaches of Eckius. To which error (*i.e.* that of Marcion who denies the truth of Christ's body in life on earth) the fathers, that they might more easily meet it, used to bring against it the supper in which Christ had instituted the sacrament of His own body, certainly a true and natural one; and that this (body in the supper) represented not a spiritual and fantasmal but a true body. Therefore on this account they said that the body of Christ was truly present in the supper but not sacramentally only: and we have never denied that the body of Christ is sacramentally and in mystery (present) in the supper, both by contemplation of faith, and by the whole operation of the sign, as aforesaid. Since therefore the whole of that presence also is nothing without the contemplation of faith, now that presence, to be or to become, of the body and blood is a matter depending on faith not on sacraments.

P. 37. "If Christ's body is a limited body, yea if it truly be made bright as ours also will be, yet it is such, corporally and truly after that mode, in which bright (glorified) bodies are. After the mode then in which it exists, in that mode it is eaten and naturally eaten (!) Augustine places Christ's body in a place in the Heaven, on account of its existing in a true mode of body. We then shall compel those who wish to eat Christ's natural substan-

manducatur (quemadmodum Papistæ et, qui ad ollas Ægyptiacas respectant, perhibent), id vero *non tantum negamus*, sed errorem esse, qui Dei verbo adversetur, constanter adseveramus.

P. 13, *De convitiis Eccii.*

Cui errori (*i.e.* Marcionis veritatem corporis Christi in vitâ in terris negantis) ut feliciter occurrerent patres, cœnam opponebant, in quâ Christus corporis Sui, nimirum veri et naturalis, sacramentum instituisset: quod corpus non spirituale aut phantasticum sed verum repræsentaret. Hanc ergo ob causam vere adesse Christi corpus dixerunt in cœnâ sed non solum sacramentaliter: et nos numquam negavimus corpus Christi sacramentaliter ac in mysterio esse in cœnâ, quum propter fidei contemplationem tum propter symboli, ut diximus, totam actionem. Cum igitur et omnis ista præsentia nihil sit sane sine fidei contemplatione, jam fidei est ista (corporis et sanguinis), esse aut fieri, præsentia, non sacramentorum.

P. 37.

Si corpus Christi finitum est, si vero clarificatum corpus est, quomodo et nostra erunt, jam corporaliter est, et vere est, *eo modo*, quo clarificata corpora sunt. Quomodo igitur est, eo modo editur et naturaliter editur. Augustinus Christi corpus in aliquo loco cœli ponit propter veri corporis modum. Cogemus igitur, qui naturale substantiale aut

tial real body in a natural real substantial way, &c. We have lately said that Christ's body is in the supper by the contemplation of faith. Now, turn they themselves whither they will, all our adversaries will find no aid to draw men to that supper in any other way. [Then follows a parable. Its seed is in Jerome, When the father of a family, &c., &c. See Part III. where it is in its fullest form, and developed into wondrous beauty.]

P. 54. "When thou consolest thyself with Christ, thou now spiritually dost eat His body, &c., but when thou comest to the Lord's supper with this spiritual eating, and givest thanks in it to the Lord, &c., and at the same time with thy brethren partakest of the bread and wine (which sacramentally are now His body) thou now properly sacramentally eatest: when, that is, thou doest within the house of God, what thou fulfillest outside His house when the mind is refreshed by this faith, which by symbols thou testifiest. But they are said sacramentally and improperly to eat, who do indeed publicly eat the visible sacrament or sign, but at home have not faith. 'Guilty of the body and blood of the 'Lord' is not as to those things which a man naturally eats or may eat in a symbolical way, but as to those things which he has falsely testified to the church that he spiritually eats, &c. They therefore are said to eat only sacramentally.

VII. Letter 37 to T. Wytttenbach. "As to what you ask about the sacrament I will most willingly speak my opinion, not that you have need of it, but that, if I anywhere err, you may ad-

---

reale corpus Christi naturaliter substantialiter ac realiter edere volunt, &c. &c. Dudum diximus corpus Christi esse in cœnâ fidei contemplatione. Nunc, quocumque se vertant, omnes adversarii nihil opis invenient quo aliter in cœnam trahant. Cum paterfamilias, &c. (See figure drawn out in his exposition to Francis I. quoted at full in Part III.)

P. 54.

Quum Christo te solaris, jam spiritualiter corpus Ejus edis, &c., verum quum ad cœnam Domini cum hac spirituali manducatione venis et Domino gratias agis, &c. &c., simul cum fratribus panem et vinum (quæ jam symbolicum corpus sunt) participas, jam proprie sacramentaliter edis, cum scilicet intus ædem agis, quod foris operaris quum mens reficitur hac fide, quam symbolis testaris. At sacramentaliter improprie dicuntur edere qui visibile sacramentum sive symbolum publice quidem comedunt sed domi fidem non habent. Reus corporis et sanguinis Domini non quæ naturaliter aut corporaliter ederit sed quæ spiritualiter se edere falso testatus sit ecclesiæ, &c. Isti ergo sacramentaliter tantum edere dicuntur.

*Vol. VII. Lit. 37, ad Thomam Wytttenbachium.*

Quod de eucharistiâ percontaris libens ac volens sententiam meam dicam, non quod istâ opus habeas, sed ut, sicubi errem admoneas et

monish me, and in turn bring back to right what I say. Deem that the eucharist is there eaten where faith is. For it was given for the purpose that we may sing the fruit of the Lord's death the grace and the gift until the Lord come. But who shall announce His dead Lord but he that knows that this food was given only for the purpose of comforting [strengthening] on one side the weakness of faith, &c., for bread confirms man's bodily strength; (and that) the other part may stimulate the dejected and despairing mind to cheerfulness, for wine makes glad the heart of man. Wherever faith is not, there no strength is produced nor joy, but evil and disease is brought to the soul; which, if it approach without faith, is either perfidious or desperate, and most deserving of condemnation....Paul teaches that judgment is eaten (by such persons)....The body of the Lord is not discerned, i.e. it is not believed to be of such a kind as it is: for it is our redemption and the ransom-price of His blood (or the bath) and they were given, to be firmly believed, for food, by which the mind within taught by God's Spirit, yet always in the clouds that hang about this body (which weighs down the soul) groping blindly, is by a visible sign rendered more certain and more joyful, &c., &c.

VIII. P. 657. "It is impossible that any thing corporeal or fleshly should be eaten here, since the mind cannot be satiated or fed with any corporeal food. [P. 658.] If His flesh when eaten cannot profit at all, without doubt neither did He wish to supply it or give it to us to eat.

---

invicem quod dicitur (a me) reducas. Eucharistiam illic edi puta, ubi fides est. In eum enim usum data est, ut mortis Domini fructum gratiam et donum cantemus usque dum Dominus veniat. Quis autem Dominum mortuum annuntiabit, nisi is qui novit hunc cibum in hunc tantum usum esse datum, ut alterâ parte confortet fidei imbecilitatem, &c.; panis enim corpus hominis confirmat; altera (pars) dejectam desperatamque mentem ad hilaritatem exstimulet; nam vinum lætificat cor hominis. Sicubi fides non est illic robor non editur neque lætitia, sed malum ac morbus advehitur animæ, quæ, si absque fide accedit, aut perfida est aut desperata damnationisque dignissima...Paulus iudicium manducari docet...non dijudicatur corpus Domini, i.e. non tale esse creditur quale est; nempe redemptio nostra et sanguinis Ejus *lutron*, sive balneum; ac ut firmiter credatur, data sunt in cibum quo animus intus, Spiritu Dei edoctus, intra tamen corporis hujus (quod aggravat animam) nebulas perpetuo cæcutiens, visibili signo certior reddatur et lætior, &c. &c.

*Vol. VIII. p. 657.*

Impossibile est ut hic quicquam corporeum vel carneum comedatur, cum anima non ullo cibo corporeo saturari vel pasci queat. P. 658. Si caro Ejus manducata non prodest quidquam, haud dubie nec ad manducandam illam nobis exhibere aut dare voluit.



P. 660. "If it is up in Heaven, His own body cannot be corporally in this earth also since His resurrection.

VII. P. 390. "To Ecolampadius, at Basle. By no means can it like the Godhead be in all places. The Truth says that His flesh is not eaten ... nor is carnal flesh the understanding. Christ answers the Jews contending concerning His corporeal flesh.... It is clear that He is speaking of His corporeal flesh. For they thought that this was proposed to them.... I beseech you therefore, most candid brethren, not to dissent one from another on so open a matter.... Be loth to be united to swear to the words of some masters of theology, &c., &c. The truth will overcome, whether they who strive against it will or no. Would that it may be a happy overcoming! But be God's will done. Mutually let us pray for each other. Farewell."

P. 660.

Si in cœlis est sursum, in terris hisce corporaliter esse non potest corpus Ipsius etiam post resurrectionem.

*Vol. VII. p. 390, Ecolampadio, ad Basileam.*

Nullo modo instar Divinitatis omnibus in locis esse potest. Veritas dicit carnem non edi...nec caro est carnalis intellectus...Christus respondet Judæis de corporeâ Ejus carne contententibus... Clarum est Ipsum de corporeâ carne loqui. Isti enim putabant hanc eis proponi...Obsecro igitur candidissimi fratres ut in re tam apertâ inter vos non dissideatis... nolite juncti esse in quorundam magistrorum verba, &c. &c.... Vincet veritas, velint nolint qui contra nituntur. Utinam feliciter vincat. Sed Domini voluntas fiat. Oremus pro nobis mutuo. Valete.

(H.) HUGH LATIMER. B. 1485. D. 1555.

Of all the Reformers of England there is none so thoroughly English as Hugh Latimer. It was seen from the first. When he was brought for admonition and animadversion, after the manner of the day, before Wolsey himself, the attack recoiled from the solid learning and steady self-possession of Latimer upon his less learned assailants. But before that time, when West, Bishop of Ely, put him to the test, by bidding him preach one sermon against Martin Luther, he was checkmated by the reply, "I do not know the doctrine of Luther, neither are we here permitted to read his works." And so all through his life he was more than a match for his enemies, till at last they sent to fetch him

for his last imprisonment. He at once intimated that he was quite ready. He had expected them some little time. They more than intimated that he might attempt to escape; but his mind was clear, like Frith's at his own seizure, that Christ's faith then demanded boldness even unto death: and so all through his imprisonment he speaks from the high ground of one who had forecast the issue and was a willing sacrifice, like his great Master. He stands to my eye like a forest oak, of the growth of ages, battling with the rough winds. They may rend off a few boughs, but they cannot shake his roots, for they are firmly coiled around and embrace the living rock. Whether he can be justified for resigning his bishopric and leaving the Primate alone, to meet the fierce and crafty assaults, the great perils and trials of consistency, and last, the evil tongues that have not yet ceased, is a difficult question. External personal sacrifices are not always the highest self-denial. But besides this, it is curious that to Latimer's final examination and to the line he took we have to go for the first most distinct utterance of Archbishop Wake's wavering policy—the maintenance not of the real presence of Christ's body and blood, but of the shortened term "The Real Presence:" omitting the words "of Christ's body and blood:" whereas the word "real" belongs to the *res ipsa* in the contention, *viz.* the natural body, and was previously almost always used in that sense.

As we so truly admire and love Bishop Latimer, perhaps it is most advisable and most honest to make this the place to state at full the objections to his phrase "a real spiritual presence" of Christ in the Lord's supper: which as will be seen Tillotson extended into "a real presence of Christ's body and blood" and Wake diminished into "a real presence of Christ" in the Eucharist. But first may we not say that Hugh Latimer seems to use the term "a real spiritual presence" rather rhetorically than logically? Did it not come from his bow as a sort of Parthian back-shot? He had fired his real arrow, *viz.* that the spiritual (or Divine) presence of Christ is everything to the believer, and is the only presence meant: and he could not resist the temptation to an orator of saying, "Talk of the reality of your presence of "the body, our spiritual presence of our Lord is just as real as "yours." But the church of Christ in England has since paid dear for this rhetorical shot.

(1) The bread is termed "true" body &c. by Hilary and Ambrose, but the term "real" body, *i.e.* of Christ in the supper, is much later, being probably due to the schoolmen. Tyndall used it just as we do. It has made confusion worse confounded to use real spiritual for the genuine and no feigned presence of Christ's Divine Spirit, for *who ever doubted* His Spiritual, *i.e.* His Divine presence in this ordinance? Then why turn language from a sense in which it means *something*, to a sense in which it means only what nobody denies? If the Eastern and Western churches had agreed to adopt this sense which Jewel so flings out at them it had been a different thing: but what but additional haziness could arise from our adopting a new and utterly different sense of this word to theirs the received sense?

(2) Another reason: that "spiritual" as used regarding Christ's presence in the supper is unfortunately a word with two senses, since it may mean Christ's spiritual body, *i.e.* His glorious body like the future body of His people, 1 Cor. xv.; so some are sure to take the term "real spiritual presence" as of Christ's body already glorified, as if *that* were present, whereas Latimer plainly means not a bodily presence of any kind, but a true and genuine presence of Christ as a spirit, *i.e.* as God. To have two ambiguous words joined together in a phrase of three words and in an article of faith was surely in a high degree unadvisable.

(3) The admission of this word by Latimer and other Reformers in this new sense, followed by Dean Overall in that ill-starred answer in the Catechism containing the words "verily" and "indeed" "*vere et realiter*," (A) has done much to make our Romish adversaries believe that after all we do hold a presence of Christ's body in the supper in some way, (B) it gives them to this day a standing-ground for the ever-repeated assertion that the Church of England does hold a bodily presence in spite of all she has said to the contrary, and (C) it has made whole flocks of our divines as well as Tillotson affirm that we hold a bodily presence, only we do not affirm the manner of it; and it has made and still makes many more, like Wake, seem to the public not to have thoroughly cleared their views: for "See," say friends and foes, "they hold a Real Presence after all." All these mischiefs are escaped when any church or any person uses "real" in its previously received sense of "true, natural," Christ's real body and the real presence of His body. Only *they must use that sense*

*only.* If the Church of England must perish on the rock of this controversy we obey the Divine will; but let her perish in the midst of clearly-defined and unambiguous terms—"in the face of day."

This discussion may be deemed to be so much subtracted from the Third Part. Perhaps it is. But one likes not to leave Hugh Latimer undefended where we are able to speak for him, nor to let a slip of his go on working evil, without trying to prevent it from going further.

*Disputation between Latimer and Smith, Vol. II. p. 255.*  
Parker Soc.

"I am sure if God would have had a new kind of sacrificing priest at mass, then some of His apostles would have made some mention thereof in their Master Christ's will [testament]... for Christ spake *never a word of sacrificing*.... Therefore sacrificing priests should now cease for ever.... The supper of the Lord was instituted to provoke us to thanksgiving and to stir us up by preaching of the gospel to remember His death till He cometh again. [P. 256.] I can never wonder enough that Peter and all the apostles would forget thus negligently this office of sacrificing, if they had thought it necessary.... Thus lo! I have written an answer to your conclusions, even as I will answer before the majesty of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, *by whose only sacrifice* I hope to possess heaven. [P. 257.] A spiritual presence may be called a real presence because to the faithful believer there is the *real spiritual* presence of the body of Christ.

*Life of Hugh Latimer, by Rev. R. Demaus, p. 485.*  
Religious Tract Society, London.

"The articles of Gardiner (1)...There is *really* present the natural body of Christ, &c., &c. Latimer: There is none other *presence* of Christ required than a *spiritual* presence; and this presence is sufficient for a Christian man, as the presence by which we abide in Christ and Christ abideth in us. [Thus implying that a presence of Christ's *body* is not required or meant. But then he goes off, saying] And this same presence may most suitably be called a real presence, for it is a presence *not feigned but true and faithful* [This is playing fast and loose with words; for who ever doubted Christ's Godhead being really present? Then why take express terms used otherwise to assert this?]: and this I here rehearse lest some sycophant or scorner should suppose me with the Anabaptists to make nothing else of the sacrament than a bare or naked sign. [Had it not been better to have told the scorner to his face that this sacrament is bare or empty of Christ's

body, but not empty, bare or naked of blessing, but on the contrary as full of Christ's grace as we are able to receive, and more; for we never empty His treasures?] But as for that which is *feigned of many* concerning the corporal presence, I for my part take it for a *papistical invention*; and therefore I think it is utterly to be rejected. (2) Transubstantiation. Latimer: I had almost said the nurse and mother of all other errors.... (3) ...The lively sacrifice of the mass...for the sins of the quick as of the dead. Latimer: Seemeth subtilly to sow sedition against the offering which Christ Himself offered, &c.

Vol. I. p. 459. Parker Society.

"The cause which letteth us from celebrating of the Lord's supper is this—We have no mind or purpose to leave sin and wickedness.... Leave your wickedness that ye may partake of it worthily.... But ye will not come. There come no more at once but those that give the holy loaves.... He that cometh to that marriage—to that banquet—death shall be unto him but an entrance or a door to everlasting life.

*Sermon of the Plough*, Vol. I. p. 72.

"When the devil had once brought Christ to the cross he thought himself sure. But there lost he all reigning. Christ said I will draw all things to Myself...per Semet ipsum—by His own self, not by any other body's sacrifice... For who can offer but Himself? He was both the offerer and the offering. And this is the mark at which the devil shooteth—to *evacuate the cross* of Christ and to mingle the institution of the Lord's supper; the which although he cannot bring to pass, yet goeth he about by his sleights and subtil means to frustrate the same; and these 1500 years he hath been a doer, only purposing to evacuate Christ's death, and to make it of small efficacy and virtue. For whereas Christ, according as the serpent was lifted up in the wilderness, would have Himself exalted, that thereby as many as trusted in Him should have salvation; but the devil would none of that; they would have us saved by a daily oblation propitiatory—by a *sacrifice expiatory*, or remissory...a thing whereby to obtain remission of sins and to have salvation. And this way the devil used to have to evacuate the death of Christ, that we might *have affiance in other things*, as in the sacrifice of the priest, whereas Christ would have us trust in His only sacrifice. Therefore He is called *juge sacrificium* (Dan. viii. 11, 12), a continual sacrifice...in effect, fruit, operation, virtue—as though He had from the beginning of the world and should continually to the world's end hang still on the cross: and He is as fresh hanging on the cross now to them that believe and trust in Him as He was 1500 years ago when He was crucified. Then let us trust upon His only death and *look for none other sacrifice propitiatory* than the same bloody

sacrifice, the lively sacrifice, and not the dry sacrifice but a bloody sacrifice. For Christ hath said, *Consummatum est*, "It is (perfectly) finished. I have taken at My Father's hand the work of "redeeming mankind. I have wrought man's redemption and "have despatched the matter." Why then mingle ye Him? Why do ye divide Him? Why make you of Him more sacrifices than one?... He hath done it *semel* once for all... If Christ by His death draweth all things, &c. then the priest at the mass... what can they draw, when Christ draws all, but lands and goods from their right heirs?... What have we to do then but *epulari in Domino*, to eat in the Lord at His supper?... What other sacrifice have we to offer but the mortification of our flesh? What other *oblation* have we to make but of obedience, of good living, &c.? But as for our redemption it is done already. It cannot be better. Christ hath done that thing so well that it cannot be amended. It cannot be devised how to make that any better than He hath done it. But the devil by the help of that Italian bishop yonder, his chaplain, hath laboured by all means that he might to frustrate the death of Christ and the merits of His passion. And they have devised for that purpose to make us believe in other vain things by his pardons, &c. &c. And of these things every one hath taken away some part of Christ's sanctification, every one hath robbed some part of Christ's passion and cross, and hath mingled Christ's death; and it hath been made to be propitiatory and satisfactory and to put away sin, &c. &c. But wo worth thee, O devil; thou hast prevailed to evacuate Christ's cross and to mingle the Lord's supper. These be the Italian bishop's devices, and the devil hath pricked at this mark—to evacuate the cross of Christ. He shot at this mark long before Christ came. He shot at it 1000 years before Christ hanged on the cross or suffered His passion."

(I.) DR THOMAS BECON, Prebendary of Canterbury, Chaplain to Cranmer, Rector of St Stephen's, Walbrook, London.

B. 1511. D. 1567.

He was a native of Norfolk, and went to St John's, Cambridge; and both frequently heard Latimer, and ascribes all his knowledge of Reformation truth to him and to Stafford of Pembroke. His first preferment was Brensett in Kent, near Romney. Having published certain works under the name of Theodore Basil he was detected, and compelled to recant at St Paul's Cross in 1542. He then retired to Derbyshire, to live by tuition. When the sun shone on Protestants under Edward VI. he reappeared and became

one of the six preachers at Canterbury. Lord Somerset and Cranmer made him their chaplain, and he took the Walbrook living. Under Mary he was ejected and imprisoned in the Tower; but he was after some time released, and fled to Strasbourg. At her death he was restored and received other preferments and the prebend. His name is also written Beacon. He is certainly reported to have been, as Fuller would have said, a burning and a shining light in the pulpits of London. His writing speaks for itself in two large volumes and a volume of prayers. But he was an unwearied writer.

*On the Sacraments.* Parker Society. P. 270.

"He that goeth about to pluck from the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ the bread and wine, destroyeth utterly the aforesaid sacrament and maketh it no sacrament.... If the substance of bread and wine be turned into the substance of the natural body and blood of Christ, then Christ is in the sacrament, really, naturally, substantially, corporeally, &c. Yea the sacrament is the real, natural, corporeal and substantial body of Christ. [P. 271.] Forasmuch as the body of Christ (though immaterial and glorified) is, remaineth, and still abideth a creature, and is not swallowed up (if I may so speak) of the Divine nature; but being joined to the Divine nature abideth still a creature and very man, it therefore followeth most certainly that Christ's body taken up into heaven neither is, nor can be, in heaven and earth at once.... Christ's body is not then in every pix and in every altar and in every massmonger's hands, as the Papists hold.... Heaven is His resting-place concerning His body, and shall be till He come to judgment, Matt. xxvi., John xiv. 16, Mark xvi., Luke xxiv., Rom. viii., Eph. i. 4, Col. iii., Heb. x., 1 Pet. iii."

(J.) ARCHBISHOP CRANMER. B. 1489. D. 1556.

The late Professor Le Bas, who with Dr Hugh James Rose once bare the palm of theological orators at Cambridge, says forcibly respecting the way in which Englishmen seem resolved to regard this remarkable prelate, that they record his apostasy in marble, and write in the sand his inestimable service, as the master-builder of England's reformed church. Le Bas deems the primate's leading qualities to have been solidity of judgment and a determination to be fully informed; and if there be truth in the current saying, that one of the highest tests of genius is patience

in enquiry and judgment, the archbishop seems to claim very high honours indeed : for this habit of accumulating precedents on any difficult question was so unusual, that the king himself once said to Gardiner "My Lord of Canterbury is too old a truant for us both." He was in early life public examiner at Oxford. Reference has been already made to the "Collections" of opinions, that Cranmer had made with his own hand from the leading fathers and divines. It was the habit of the time for each divine thus to make a kind of hortus siccus for himself, and to these the reforming leaders continually turned. They were perhaps too much on the principle of a book of dried specimens, and were often referred to and produced without fresh reference to their context. This takes from the value of many of the English controversial writings of that time. But every age has its failings as well as every man : and the more one enquires into the labour of Cranmer it is found to have been intense, and his acquisitions to have been almost unlimited : but most eminent of all his qualities was the coolness of his judgment in the midst of a constant war that was utterly alien to his predilections. Research and peace and forgiving kindness were his natural inclinations. He was of a Norman family long settled in Lincolnshire, though born in Nottinghamshire.

Of all the portraits of him which I have seen, the only one that seems to me to give a true and full representation of this great founder of the English church is in the third volume of Wordsworth's Ecclesiastical Biography. You could easily believe all Professor Le Bas' estimate of his peculiar powers, as you look at that small engraving. The acute steadfast look of the eye and the immoveable firm resolution of the rest of the features seem to note a mind equal to any balancings of arguments and still on the look-out for new points of view. The upper lip, though good as it is in all masterly men, is less indicative perhaps of resolution than the rest of the face. The great picture at Lambeth only seems to differ from all that has been said of the other picture in that his mind in it is at the moment less vigorously at work, but the characteristics of the features are the same. The forehead is also in both large enough for his work, but too little for a Lord Bacon.

The papal examiners of the three chief English prelates are said to have set them down thus : Cranmer as learned and grave—Ridley as ready and acute—and Latimer as mirthful and



yet solid. Yet there was another current saying, that Latimer leaned on Cranmer, and Cranmer on Ridley. Professor Blunt finishes his estimate of Cranmer's learning with this testimony, that the archbishop had not only read but annotated at the side the principal fathers and other books in his own hand. Fuller says his only fault was being what he calls too good, that is, too easy and flexible: and Macaulay I should almost say blasphemes his eminent Christian forgiveness by calling him "an easy foe": but all this seems to miss his true character. His old Norman blood has been lost sight of, and no such malleable spirit as they describe could have wrought out the mingling of extreme firmness with partial allowance, which characterized the Church of England, as it came from his hands, even better in some respects than it is now. All Parker's changes were not for the better, notwithstanding the stoutness of Bishop Geste. Also he refused all consent to the revolutionary transfer of the crown from Queen Mary to Lady Jane Grey.

*The Volume on the Lord's Supper. Disputations at Oxford.*  
Parker Society.

P. 403. "Weston quotes Chrysostom ending 'I am become your brother. I took flesh and blood for you. Again, My flesh and blood by which I am your kinsman I deliver to you.' Syllogism proving Christ's true natural and organical flesh is given us to be eaten. Cranmer. I grant it. Weston. Therefore we eat it with the mouth. Cranmer. I deny it. We eat it through faith. Weston repeats syllogism. Cranmer. I grant He took and gave (*i. e.* in that sacrament) the same true natural and organical flesh wherein He suffered: and yet He feedeth (us) spiritually; and *that flesh* is received spiritually.

*Book I. Of the Sacrament.*

P. 14. "Berengarius himself had a godly judgment in the matter; but by the tyranny of Nicolas II. *he was constrained to make a devilish recantation*, as I shewed in my third book (17 c. p. 24).

*Defensio*, same vol. Cranmer's preface, quoted by Waterland, p. 252.

"Moreover when I say and repeat many times in my book that *the body of Christ* is present *in them* that worthily receive the sacrament, lest any man should mistake my words and think that I mean that though Christ be not present corporally in the visible signs, yet He is corporally present in the persons that duly receive Him, this is to advertise the reader that *I mean no*

*such thing.* [Note. He said that the body of Christ is present in them: and now he says that He is *not* corporally present.] My meaning is in force, grace, virtue, benefit, &c. really and effectually present. [Then this cannot relate to body, which is not a fount of grace, &c., &c.]

P. 413. "Chedsey. Here you have falsified Hilary: for you have set *vero sub mysterio* for *vere sub mysterio*, &c. Cranmer. Assuredly I am not guilty of any deceit herein. It may be that the copy which I followed had *sub vero mysterio*, &c. God I call to witness, I have always hated falsifying; and if you had leisure and lust to hear false citations, I could recite unto you six hundred.

*From the Preface to the original edition of the Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament. 1550.*

P. 6. "What availeth it to take away beads, pardons, pilgrimages and such other like popery, so long as two chief roots remain unpulled up?... The rest is but branches and leaves...or the cutting down of weeds...but the very body of the tree or rather the roots of the weeds is the popish doctrine of *transubstantiation*, of the real presence of Christ's flesh and blood in the sacrament of the altar (as they call it) and of the *sacrifice and oblation* of Christ made by the priest for the salvation of the quick and the dead; which roots, if they be suffered to grow in the Lord's vineyard, *they* will overspread all the ground again with the old errors and superstitions.

P. 366, end of the Fifth Book. "As at the Lord's table the priest distributeth wine and bread to feed the body, so we must think that inwardly by faith we see Christ feeding both body and soul to eternal life. What comfort can be devised any more in this world for a Christian man? And on the other side what discomfort is in your papistical doctrine, what doubts, what perplexities, what absurdities, what iniquities! What availeth it us that there is no bread and wine, or that Christ *is really* under the forms of bread and wine and not in us?... What benefit is it to a wicked man to eat Christ and to receive death by Him that is life?

P. 98, same vol. De oblatione et sacrificio Christi. Operis conclusio to Book V. Quâ in cœnâ, quemadmodum corpore *verum panem et vinum* percipimus, ita spiritu *vero corpore et sanguine* Servatoris et Redemptoris nostri Jesu Christi alimur. In English. "And in that supper as we *in our body* receive true bread and wine, so in our spirit we are nourished with *the true body and blood* of our Saviour and Redeemer Jesus Christ." [Note. Can any one wonder that Hallam charges our Reformers with Bucerism? For what can true body mean here but Christ's

natural body, as true bread and wine mean natural bread and wine? whereas in John vi.: "My flesh is truly food and My blood is truly drink," ἀληθῶς, means antitypically: see Dr Turton as quoted in his place in the nineteenth century.]

*Answer to Gardiner, I. On the Presence of Christ.*

P. 52. "Although we do affirm according to God's word, that Christ is in all persons that truly believe in Him, in such sort that with His flesh and blood He doth spiritually nourish and feed them and giveth them everlasting life, and doth *assure* them thereof, as well by the promise of His word as by the sacramental bread and wine in His holy supper, which He did institute for the same purposes, yet we do not a little vary from the heinous errors of the papists. [How far is it right to say that Christ feeds us with His flesh and blood without explaining that the language is figurative, is a serious question: but I suppose Cranmer would say that by spiritually *he meant* that Christ's words in John vi. are figurative of Christ's feeding the soul by grace and not upon His flesh and blood. In the rest of this passage the sacrament is only spoken of as joint teacher with the word.] [P. 53.] The papists do teach that Christ is in the visible signs...the truth is, He is *corporally* neither in the bread nor wine ..but is *corporally* in Heaven, and *spiritually* in His lively members, which be His temples, where He inhabiteth. [P. 54.] *They* say that Christ is corporally under or in the forms of bread and wine; we say that Christ is *not there* neither corporally nor spiritually; but in them that worthily eat and drink the bread and wine. He is spiritually and corporally in the Heavens. They say that when any man eateth the bread and drinketh the cup Christ goeth into his mouth or stomach with the bread and wine, &c. But we say that Christ is in the whole man both in body and soul of him that worthily eateth the bread and drinketh the cup and not in his mouth or stomach only. [A most unfortunate and misleading antithesis; for not only is not the word "figuratively" inserted; which is the only way in which Christ (*God and man*) is in our bodies; but the word "spiritually" [equivalent to "with a spiritual meaning," 1 Cor. x.] is left out; so Gardiner is led to believe and assert that Cranmer believes that Christ's manhood as well as His Godhead is in the body of a believing communicant: whereas Cranmer's real meaning is that Christ is *always* spiritually, i. e. in a spiritual or figurative sense, present; and that His Godhead is literally always present in believers, and specially or with an emphasis in the Lord's supper.]

P. 57. "We say that no earthly creature can eat the body of Christ, nor drink His blood, but only man. [P. 68.] They say that every man good and evil eateth the body of Christ. We say that both do eat the sacramental bread and drink the wine; but

none do eat the very body of Christ and drink His blood but only they that be lively members of His body." And so on : the same remarks holding.

I cannot leave Cranmer without saying that Le Bas' estimate of him seems to me more and more true as I think upon it year after year. I seem to myself to appreciate the quiet, strong and finished energy of the language of our Prayer-book, as I identify it in many parts with Cranmer's spirit. Our debt to him is only less than our debt to Tyndall for so large a part of our English Bible. O that he had been clear and consistent on this sacrament !

(K.) CRANMER AND KNOX.

Dr Lorimer has published a book entitled "John Knox and the Church of England," London, 1875. Chapter III. relates how John Knox was called to King Edward's Court at London, as one of the Royal Chaplains, in 1533, while the Second Prayer-Book of Edward VI. was being discussed in privately printed copies previously to its being published ; and how Knox used his opportunity both in preaching before the king, and afterward, to get the notice about kneeling at the communion struck out, and at first with some hopes of success, since he seems to have persuaded the king and several bishops. It had been previously left open ; and Knox as a licensed preacher, sent by the primate, first to Berwick, and afterwards to Newcastle, had given the bread and wine to seated communicants, calling that posture "the table gesture," and arguing that it better corresponded to the method of reclining on couches as used by the Jews at the Passover. Essay on the Lord's Supper and the Passover, Part I. But Cranmer overcame Knox's opposition by a letter addressed to the king's council (Lorimer, p. 103), October 7, 1552. The primate's chief argument is the very sound one that we are not absolutely bound in religious services to adhere to the exact words of the original institution, nor to the exact original form of service. And he argues that as the communicants are kneeling in prayer before and after, it is more convenient to let them kneel on through the reception.

At p. 110, is given from the Privy Council entries, the record of the acceptance of "a letter to the Lord Chancellor to cause to

"be joined to the Book of Common Prayer a certain declaration... touching the kneeling at the Holy Communion." It will be seen that Cranmer seems to have produced this rubric to put an end to the persevering efforts of John Knox to get the sitting posture introduced; to which Edward VI. himself and many at court had been won over. The addition of this rubric was only just in time to enable it to go out with the first edition of the king's Second Prayer-Book. In fact some copies went out without it, and its insertion in the others breaks the numbers of the pages!

It appears therefore that it is to Cranmer's decision of character that we owe the continuance of the practice of kneeling at the reception of the Lord's supper; and moreover that this much-abused and blackened rubric was the instrument of the victory: and yet for a long time it has been thought that John Knox supplied this rubric at Cranmer's desire. Surely we are much indebted to Dr Lorimer for bringing the truth to light.

(L.) NICHOLAS RIDLEY, PUBLIC ORATOR AND BISHOP OF  
LONDON. B. 1500. D. 1555.

He was born in Northumberland, and one may well recognize in him some of the inherited border-firmness nursed in his ancestry in many a border-foray. The great poet of the North cites the old ballad "How the fierce Thirlwalls and Riddleys and all," &c., and it is curious in the historical notice of this divine to read of Richard Ridley of Aardriding; as it seems to give a local interpretation to the Hardriding in the next line of the ballad. I push the matter no further; but remark that the learning that it is the fashion to deny to Cranmer is freely assigned to Ridley. Still none of them were sufficiently free from the practical English business of life to escape Dr Döllinger's sweeping censure of English Protestant divines of that day, as being of an inferior order in point of learning to the chief of their brethren on the continent. However this be, God is served by men of various powers in different lands and under different circumstances: and England has had a sufficient proportion of men of the very first rank in some or other lines of thought and discovery, not to press for more than her just due in theology.

*Brief Declaration against Transubstantiation*, written in prison,  
A. D. 1555. Parker Society.

P. 5. "Thou knowest O Heavenly Father that the controversy about the sacrament of the blessed body and blood of Thy dear Son our Saviour Jesus Christ hath troubled not of late only thy church of England, France, Germany and Italy, but also many years ago.. Thou knowest O Lord how this wretched world rolleth up and down and reeleth to and fro, and careth not what Thy will is, so it may abide in wealth. If truth have wealth, then who are so stout to defend the truth as they? But if Christ's cross be laid on truth's back, then they vanish away straight as wax before the fire...That which was said, that with the receipt of the holy sacrament of the blessed body and blood of Christ is received of every one, good or bad, either life or death—it is not meant that they which are dead before God may hereby receive life, or the living before God can hereby receive death. For as none is meet to receive natural food, whereby the natural life is nourished, except he be born and in life before: so no man can feed, by receipt of the holy sacrament of the food of eternal life, except he be regenerate and born of God before; and on the other side, none receiveth damnation, which is not dead before.

P. 8. "This *remembrance* ... as the author thereof is Christ (both God and man) so by the almighty power of God it far passeth all kinds of remembrance that any other man is able to make ... for whosoever receiveth this holy sacrament thus ordained in remembrance of Christ, he receiveth therewith *either death or life*.

P. 9. "Now the partaking of Christ's body and of His blood to the faithful and godly is the partaking or fellowship of life and immortality.... With the receipt of the holy sacrament of the body and blood of Christ is received of every one, good or bad, either life or death, (the one) born of God before, (the other) dead before. [Also p. 8, 'This remembrance,' &c., &c.]

P. 10. "The controversy is not whether...it is but a bare sign and figure of Christ (and nothing else) or no: for all do grant that St Paul's words do require that 'the bread which we break is 'a partaking of the body of Christ'... I do plainly affirm that the second answer (made unto the chief question and principal point) I am persuaded to be the very true meaning and sense of God's holy word, *i.e.* that *the natural substance of bread and wine* is the true natural substance of the holy sacrament of the blessed body and blood of our Saviour Christ.

P. 10. "And again this is true that the truth neither needeth neither is maintained with lies... [P. 11.] There be divers points, &c. &c. Yet nevertheless, as in a man diseased in divers parts commonly the original cause of such divers diseases, which is spread abroad in the body, doth come from one chief member, as from the stomach or from the head: even so all five aforesaid points do chiefly hang upon this one question, which is, What is the matter of the sacrament, whether it is the natural substance of bread, or the natural substance of Christ's own body? The truth of this question truly tried out and agreed upon, no doubt will cease [make to cease, *καταπαύω*] the controversy in all the rest. For if it be Christ's own natural body, born of the virgin; then assuredly (seeing that all the learned men in England, so far as I know, both new and old, grant there to be but one substance) then I say they must needs (1) grant transubstantiation, *i.e.* a change of the substance of bread into the substance of Christ's body: then also (2) they must grant the carnal and corporal presence of Christ's body; then (3) must the sacrament be adored with the honour due unto Christ Himself for the unity of the two natures in one person; then (4) if the priest do offer the sacrament, he doth offer indeed Christ Himself; and finally (5) the murderer, the adulterer or wicked man receiving the sacrament must needs receive also the natural substance of Christ's own blessed body, both flesh and blood... Now on the other side if after the truth shall be truly tried out, it be found that the substance of bread is the material substance of the sacrament, although as for the change of *the use, office and dignity* of the bread, the bread indeed sacramentally is changed into the body of Christ [Does not *even this* need consideration? the bread is changed *in use, office and dignity*, which means that its use, office and dignity are changed; but is it correct to say it is changed *into* Christ's body sacramentally; whereas *all* that is done is, that it is changed *into* a sacramental figure of Christ's body?...] If I say the true solution of that former question, whereupon all these controversies do hang, be, that the natural substance of bread is the material substance in the sacrament of Christ's blessed body, then must it follow... that there is no such thing in deed and in truth as they call transubstantiation, for the substance of bread remaineth still in the sacrament of the body. Then also the natural substance of Christ's human nature, which he took of the Virgin Mary, is in Heaven, where it reigneth now in glory, and not here enclosed in the form of bread. Then that Godly honour which is only due unto God the Creator [and] *may not be done* unto the creature without idolatry, *is not to be done* unto the holy sacrament. Then also the wicked... I mean the impenitent murderer, adulterer and such like... do not receive the natural substance of the blessed body and blood of Christ. Finally then doth it follow that

Christ's blessed body and blood, which was once only offered and shed upon the cross, being available for the sins of all the whole world, is offered up no more in the natural substance thereof....

P. 12. "For the change of the use office and dignity of the bread, the bread indeed sacramentally is changed into the body of Christ, as the water at baptism is sacramentally changed into the fountain of regeneration, and yet the material substance remaineth all one as was before.... The wicked...do not receive *the natural substance* of the blessed body and blood of Christ... (for) the natural substance of Christ's human nature...is in Heaven, where it reigneth now in glory, and not here, enclosed under the form of bread.

P. 13. "Now then you will say, What kind of presence do they [the Protestant books] grant, and what do they deny? Briefly they deny the presence of Christ's body in the natural substance of His human and assumed nature, and grant the presence of the same by grace; *i.e.* they affirm and say that the substance of the natural body and blood of Christ is only remaining in Heaven, and so shall be unto the latter day when He shall come again in glory accompanied with the angels of Heaven to judge both the quick and the dead. And the same natural substance of the very body and blood of Christ, because it is united in the Divine nature to Christ the second Person of the Trinity, therefore it hath not only life in itself, but is also able to give life unto so many as be or shall be partakers thereof; *i.e.* to all that do believe on His name, which are not born of blood, as St John saith, or of the will of the flesh, or of the will of man, but are born of God [this is Cyril of Alexandria in a receptionist dress]; though the self-same substance abide still in Heaven, and they, for the time of their pilgrimage, dwell here upon earth. By grace I say, *i.e.* by the gift of this life (mentioned in John) and the properties of the same, meet for our pilgrimage here upon earth, the same body of Christ is here present with us. Even as, for example, we say the same sun, which, *in substance*, never removeth his place out of the heavens, is yet present here by his beams, light and natural influence where it shineth upon earth. [Ridley involves the clearest implication that the substance of the body of Christ "is not here." Also further, the strongest words in John vi., "My flesh which I will give for the life of the world," v. 51, do not mean that life comes to us out of the flesh, from the abundance of life with which it overflowed to all that touched it, as Cyril of Alexandria argued. Cyril's argument is this, If the touching of the dead girl by Christ's flesh caused the life that was in His mere body to overflow into her, how much more shall we, if we receive that life-giving, *lit.* life-making body, *ζωοποιὸν σῶμα*, into our mouths, be partakers of everlasting life in the body also! But this I reserve for Part III. It seems



to me a most sad thing that such a noble propugnator as Ridley should have slid into this pit, and added that the same body—which he had said *was in heaven*—is here present with us. Does it not compel us to rejudge even Ridley's judgments?]

P. 16. "The very words of Christ...enforce us to confess that very bread remaineth still and also open to us how *that bread* may be and is *thus*, by His Divine power, *His body*; which is given to us.

P. 18. "(Gardiner and others) grant to certain of the old doctors as Chrysostom and Ambrose, &c., that the words 'This is My body,' are the words of consecration of the sacrament of His body; 'yet,' say they, 'these words may at least be *so called*, 'because *they do assure us of the consecration thereof*, whether it 'be done before these words be spoken or no.'

P. 20. "Note two things. First that the word 'is' hath no such strength and signification in the Lord's words to make or to signify any transubstantiation: secondly, that in the Lord's words, whereby He instituted the sacrament of His blood, He used a figurative speech. How vain then is it, that some so earnestly do say, as if it were an infallible rule, that in doctrine and in the institution of the sacraments Christ used no figures... when as here, whatever thou sayest was in the cup, neither that nor the cup itself... was the New Testament. Thus in one sentence spoken of Christ in the institution of the sacrament of His blood, the figure must help us twice.

P. 21. "Understanding that which is in the cup by 'the cup' is figurative speech.... Thou canst not truly say that (whether it was truly wine or Christ's blood) to be the New Testament is without figure also. *Thus in one sentence the figure must help us twice*. So untrue is it... that Christ useth no figure in the doctrine of faith nor in the institution of the sacrament.

P. 26. "Innocentius...and Duns do attribute the word (transubstantiation) *unto the word* 'He blessed:' but the rest for the most part to 'This is My body.'

*Conference with Mr Secretary Bourne, Fecknam, &c.*

P. 161. "Sir, quoth I, methinks it is not charitably done to bear the people in hand that *any man* doth so lightly esteem the sacrament, as to make it *but a figure*.... As for me, I assure you, I make no less of the sacrament than this. I say whosoever receiveth the sacrament, he receiveth therewith life or death. No,

quoth the Secretary, Scripture saith not so. Sir, quoth I, though not in the same sound of words yet it doth in the same sense; and St Augustine saith it in the sound of words also; for Paul saith, 'The bread which we break is it not the communion of the 'body of Christ?' [N.B. a different thing], and St Aug. *Manduca vitam, bibe vitam* [Eat life, drink life]. Pope. What can ye make of it when ye say there is not the real body of Christ? Sir, quoth I, when ye hear God's word truly preached, if ye do believe and abide, ye shall and do receive life withal, &c., &c.

P. 199. *Discussions at Oxford*. "It (a carnal presence) destroyeth and taketh away the institution of the Lord's supper... which was commanded only to be used and continued till Christ Himself should come. If therefore He be now really present, in the body of His flesh, the supper must cease; for a remembrance is not of a thing present, but of a thing past and absent.

P. 61. "I will...declare what true presence of Christ's body in the sacrament of the Lord's supper I hold and affirm with the words of God *and the ancient fathers*...The bread is the body...in the remembrance of Him and His death...I say and confess the bread which we break to be the communion and partaking of Christ's body, *with the ancient and the faithful fathers*...not only a signification, but also, given to the faithful, *the grace of Christ's body, i.e.* the food of life and immortality. Also with Aug., We eat life and drink life, &c.; we receive the nature of flesh and benediction *which giveth life* (in bread and wine) with Cyril; and with the same Cyril, the virtue of the very flesh of Christ, life and grace of His body, the property of the only-begotten: that is to say *life, as he in plain words expoundeth it, &c.; spiritual flesh, but not that which was crucified*. With Jerome I suppose it may appear how far we are from saying that the faithful receive nothing else at the Lord's table but a figure of the body of Christ.

P. 205. "The words of the Lord's supper, the circumstances of the Scripture, the analogy of the sacraments *and the sayings of the fathers* do most effectually and plainly prove a figurative speech in the words of the Lord's supper. This is the minor of the sixth argument...The fathers do quite overthrow transubstantiation; but of all other most evidently and plainly Irenæus, Origen, Cyprian, Chrysostom (to Cæsarius), Augustine against Adimantus, Gelasius, Cyril, Epiphanius, Chrysostom on Matt. xx., Rabanus, *Damascene* and Bertram.

P. 234. "I never said that Christ gave only a figure of His body; for indeed He gave Himself in a real communication, *i.e.* He gave His flesh after a communication of His flesh. Weston. Ye say Christ gave not His body but a figure of His body. Ridley.

I say not so. I say He gave His own body verily, but He gave it by a real effectual and spiritual communication.

P. 218. "The verity of the body of Christ is the true faith of the body of Christ. [Ridley says this as one very hard pressed indeed.]

P. 216. "Weston. One body, saith Chrysostom. Ridley. But not after the manner of bodily substance. Christ in all places, *perfect* here and perfect there, one only body. 'Here and 'there' in Chrysostom *do assign no places*.

P. 238. "The sacrament of the blood is the blood.

. P. 274. *Last examination before the Commissioners*. "Both you and I agree herein that in the sacrament is *the very true and natural* body and blood of Christ, even *that which was born* of the Virgin Mary, which ascended into Heaven, which sitteth on the right hand of the Father, which shall come from thence to judge the quick and the dead. *We only differ in modo*: in the way and manner of being. We confess all, one thing to be in the sacrament, and dissent *in the manner* of being there. [N.B. If anything were wanted to prove this excellent martyr to be far from holding pure clear Protestant doctrine on this subject, I think the foregoing must convince anyone and everyone.] I being fully by God's word thereunto persuaded, confess *Christ's natural body* is to be in the sacrament *indeed*, by spirit and grace, because that whosoever receiveth worthily that bread and wine receiveth effectuously Christ's body and drinketh His blood, *i.e.* he is made effectually partaker of His passion; and you make a grosser kind of being, enclosing a natural a lively and a moving body under the shape or form of bread and wine. Now, this difference considered, to the question I thus answer: that in the sacrament of the altar is the natural body and blood of Christ, *vere et realiter* [N.B. How can any of us blame Dean Overall for setting in the Catechism the answer "The body and blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received, &c.," when here the martyr Ridley says the very same thing?], indeed and really *i.e.* by grace and efficacy: for so every worthy receiver receiveth the *very true body* of Christ. [Surely a most unhappy binding together of exactly opposite terms in one *amphibious* formula.] But if you mean 'really and indeed,' so that you would include a lively and moveable body under the forms of bread and wine [which is just what these forms of speech did and do mean]. *then in that sense* is not Christ's body in the sacrament *really* and *indeed*. [A most important conclusion, and Overall should have known and attended to this last part and not to the first. But what a pity he had his excuse in the first part!]

The following answer taken and penned by the notaries.

"Ridley. Always, *my protestation reserved*, I answer thus; that in the sacrament there is a certain change, in that that bread which was before common bread is now made a lively *presentation* of Christ's body and not only a *figure*, but effectuously representeth His body, that even so as the mortal body was nourished by that visible bread, so is the internal soul fed with the heavenly food of *Christ's body*, which the eyes of faith see, as the bodily eyes see only bread....Such a sacramental *mutation* I grant to be in the bread and wine, which truly is no small change, but such a change as no mortal man can make but only that omnipotency of Christ's word...Ridley in answer to the Bishop of Lincoln. *All the doctors* confessed that the true nature of bread and wine remaineth.

P. 236. "I acknowledge gladly the *true body* of Christ to be in the *Lord's supper* in such sort as the church of Christ (which is the spouse of Christ and is taught of the Holy Ghost and guided by God's word) doth acknowledge the same...*not the corporal presence* of the *body of His flesh*. [N.B. Thus at last our good Reformer comes out under a clear expression not to be mistaken, and there we heartily rejoice in him.]

P. 323. "Fourth reason. The form of an altar was ordained for the sacrifices of the law, and therefore the altar in Greek is called *θυιαστήριον*, quasi sacrificii locus. But now both the law and the sacrifices thereof do cease: wherefore the form of the altar used in the law ought to cease withal."

(M.) JOHN CALVIN. B. 1509. D. 1564.

There is a division among the readers of Calvin, whether his Institutes or his Commentaries have put the church under greater obligation. The latter indeed are by many deemed without a parallel. But the citations here are from the former, and from his specific treatise on this subject. In the Helvetic Confession he has changed or conceded much of his earlier opinions. His dedication of his Institutes to Francis I. is an affecting instance of the pouring out of Heavenly truth with no more effect than the falling of rain on a rock. Alas how long from that date had France a continued succession of immoral sovereigns and corrupt courts! The dark series lasted to the feeble Louis XVI. What gigantic miseries might the country have escaped had Calvin's preface told upon Francis! But as to Calvin's opinions on the holy supper it is difficult to see how they benefited the church. The mutual inconsistency of his statements repeated again and

again in the Institutes, has made the selecting of extracts unsatisfactory, and even painful. Then his starting with the assumption that the language of Christ *must* imply that we receive the body of Christ in a substantial mode, and that we derive benefit in the supper from the very body of Christ itself, though it is in Heaven, is a kind of denial of an understanding to those that wholly reject such premisses. It is difficult to shake off the opinion that he felt that he must strike out some new line—a *via media* between the German and Swiss churches. Whether he thought that his hope of doing extensive good to the church depended on his exhibiting a different platform from either, or whether personal rivalry or the influence of current opinions biassed him, I should not venture to express an opinion. But I am free to confess that I cannot see any clear basis of difference between his views and those that had prevailed at Zurich and in Protestant Switzerland, except the assumed *substantiality* of a bodily presence of Christ in this sacrament, which he alternately affirms and denies. Yet the Institutes seem to have been written while he was under the protection of Margaret of Valois, and before he came to Geneva. I must confess that my own singularly high admiration of Calvin's powers and reasonings in general, with all allowance for certain unpleasing peculiarities of opinion, is more abated by his conduct on the Lord's supper than by all other objectionable points of his system taken together. Had he held from the first what he united with the pastors of Zurich in putting forth at the last, there had been much more unity in the Protestant Communion, and we might now be much further on our way to the simplicity of the Bible's words on this simple and expressive rite of Christ.

Of the three great teachers at Geneva, before their banishment, Fuller ascribes boldness to Farel, eloquence to Viret, and solid substance to Calvin. Calvin on his return had everything in his own hands. He was king and priest.

If a word may be added as to Calvin's extraordinary powers, compare him with the greatest of those who like him have stood in the position of being not only theological masters, but almost civil rulers of a city or a state. Put him by the side of Chrysostom at Antioch or of Ambrose at Milan! Augustine at Hippo stood at the pastor's zenith, but he aimed at nothing more. Compare then Calvin with the great Cyril, or even with Athanasius, or with Bernard of Clairvaux: or take the two yet more parallel cases,

Savonarola, the prophet and dictator of Florence, or Zwingel, almost the priest-king of Zurich itself, with Berne and Glarus, and Basle, and Strasburg, also much disposed to follow the lead. It may be doubted if any of these did as much as Calvin to work out the hard problem of a church and state acting combinedly on the principles of the Bible in all things; and which of them if any made so few important mistakes as Calvin? One only blot is charged on him, the execution of Servetus; and historical documents have been adduced to clear him of that charge. Yet Geneva has given its public honours to Rousseau! Perhaps this is partly to be accounted for by Calvin's want of that winning sweetness which the Genevese so appreciated in Beza: but the greatness of Calvin's character firmly retained his intimate friends, and won for him general respect if not love. He left behind him only 120 crowns of gold. The sick, whom he loved to visit, the weak and uncertain, to whom he supplied firmness of mind, and the assemblies and congregations that heard him lecture and preach many times a week, must in all have constituted a large company to mourn for his departure. He is counted by Papal writers the second chief of the Reformation. They ascribe to him an amount of art that gave him almost as much mastery over men's minds as Luther obtained by his genius and impetuosity. They assign to Calvin more of the power of logic in writing. Luther, they say, complained that he was always labouring to control his temper, and seldom succeeded; but Calvin was able half to conceal his own defects. Calvin valued himself for persuasive powers and precision of style.

It was Farel who prevailed on Calvin to settle with him in Geneva.

P. 364. "First the signs are bread and wine, which represent to us an invisible aliment, which we receive from Christ's flesh and blood. [The first sentence assumes a spiritual benefit from Christ's actual flesh, when the real question between Rome and England is, Are all the terms of that sort in Scripture intended literally or figuratively? If the latter, does any benefit come to us from Christ's body now?] Already, therefore, we see the end to which this

---

*Institut.* A.D. 1535. IV. C. 17. § 1. Vol. VIII. p. 364 of his works.  
Amsterdam, 1667.

Primo, signa sunt panis et vinum, quæ invisibile alimentum, quod percipimus ex carne et sanguine Christi, nobis representant. Jam ergo habemus in quem finem spectat mystica hæc benedictio—nempe quo nobis

mystic benediction (of Christ) is looking—*viz.* to confirm to us that Christ's body was so sacrificed for us, that we now feed upon it, &c. We are commanded therefore to receive and to eat for our salvation that body which was once for all offered up, that while we see ourselves become partakers of this, we may certainly determine in ourselves that the virtue of that life-giving death would be efficacious, as often as He holds out to us that sacred blood to be drunk, &c.... We have so solid a witness of all these things in this sacrament, that we must certainly determine that they [the body and blood] are truly supplied [exhibited, Latin], no otherwise than if He Himself was set before our sight, and was handled by our hands. I have now distributed the body and blood, &c. That the body of Christ is the only food for the soul that is to grow and be quickened... By which He not doubtfully suggests that His own body will be to us life instead of bread for the spiritual food of the mind, because it was to be set forth to die for our salvation, but to be held forth to us to eat, when He makes us partakers of it by faith. [To say His body is eaten only by believing persons does not aid much. Is His natural body given to anyone to eat except "in a figure"?]... Once therefore He gave Himself, &c. He daily gives it to be partaken of, inasmuch as [lit. as far as] it was crucified where He offers it to us by the word of the Gospel, where He signs that furnishing [or giving of Himself] with the sacred mystery of His supper, where He completes that very thing (inwardly) which He externally signs. For there are some who define that to eat Christ's flesh and drink His blood is in one word nothing else than to believe in Christ Himself... But there is this

---

confirmet corpus Domini sic pro nobis immolatum esse, *ut nunc eo vescamur*, &c. Corpus ergo quod semel oblatum est in salutem nostram jubemur accipere et comedere, ut, dum hujus fieri nos videmus participes vivificæ illius mortis virtutem certo statuamus in nobis efficacem fore, &c., quoties sacrum illum *sanguinem* libandum *nobis porrigit*, &c. § 3. Horum omnium adeo solidam habemus testificationem in hoc sacramento, ut certo statuendum sit *vere* nobis *exhiberi*, non secus ac si Ipse præsens aspectui nostro obiceretur ac manibus attractaretur [Calvin's system turns on the meaning of the two words *vere* and *exhiberi*]. Corpus et *sanguinem* nunc distribui, &c. Corpus Christi vegetandæ et vivificandæ animæ unicum esse cibum... § 5. Quibus haud dubie innuit Suum nobis corpus pro pane futurum ad spiritualem animi cibum vitam, quia in mortem pro salute nostra exponendum erat. Nobis autem porrigi, ut vescamur, quando fide nos facit ejus participes. Semel itaque Ipsum dedit, &c. Quotidie dat ubi participandum, quatenus crucifixum est, evangelii verbo nobis offert, ubi eam *exhibitionem* sacro cænæ mysterio *obsignat*, ubi id ipsum complet quod exterius designat... [The explanation follows after three more sentences]. Sunt enim qui manducare Christi carnem et sanguinem Ejus bibere uno verbo definiunt nihil esse aliud quam in Christum Ipsum credere. After three more sentences, Verum

difference between my words and the words of those persons, that to them to eat is only to believe; I, by believing *that the flesh of Christ is eaten* (since He is made ours by faith) and that that eating is the fruit and effect of faith [N.B. This sentence has verged from its proper construction], it seems to me to follow better from faith. [In the expression of Calvin, 'The words of 'those persons that to them to eat is only to believe,' is a manifest allusion to the divines of Zurich and to Zwingel's own words, *Edere est credere*, in which he varied Augustine's expression, *Quid dentes paras? Crede et manducasti*. But Calvin seems subtly to suggest a different interpretation.]... Moreover He makes the flesh itself, in which He dwells, life-giving to us, so that we are fed by partaking of it to immortality, John vi. 48, &c. And by these words He teaches not only that He Himself is life, but that by coming down [from Heaven] He shed abroad that power into the flesh which He put on... They now find life in *His own proper flesh*... But although the flesh of Christ has not from itself so great virtue as to quicken us, &c., it has been perfused with a fulness of life, to transmit to us, &c. ... For although it seem incredible that Christ's flesh should penetrate to us in places of so great distance, so that it may be for food to us, let us remember how far the virtue of the Holy Spirit stands high above all our perceptions, [Does God change the elementary nature of body?] and how foolish it is to wish to measure immensity by our footrule. What therefore our mind comprehends not let faith conceive... He now testifies of the sacred communion of His own flesh and blood (because Christ pours out His life into us no less

---

hoc inter mea et istorum verba interest quod illis manducare est duntaxat credere, ego, credendo *manducari Christi carnem* (quia fide noster efficitur) eamque manducationem fructum effectumque esse fidei, mihi ex fide potius consequi videtur [unless C. believes some eating of Christ's real natural flesh, what is the difference? I would have agreed that manducatio ex fide consequitur]. § 8. Quin et ipsam, in qua residet, carnem vivificam nobis *reddit* ut ejus participatione ad immortalitatem pascamur, John vi. 48, 51, 58. Quibus verbis docet non modo Se vitam esse...sed descendendo vim istam *in carnem*, quam induit, diffudisse [see Cyril Alex.]...Vitam *in propria carne nunc* reperiunt...§ 9. Etsi autem tantam a seipsa virtutem non habeat Christi caro, ut nos vivificet, &c. vitæ plenitudine perfusa est quam ad nos transmitteret, &c. [contrast Bucer]. § 10. Etsi enim incredibile videtur in tantâ locorum distantia penetrare ad nos Christi carnem, ut nobis sit in cibum, meminerimus quantum supra sensus omnes emineat Spiritus Sancti virtus, et quam sit stultum immensitatem modo nostro velle metiri. [Christ's body is not immensus: and that is the subject at issue.] Quod ergo mens nostra non comprehendit, concipiat fides [begging the question that the sense is not figurative. Hoc Ithacus velit, &c.], &c. Jam sacram illam carnis et sanguinis Sui communicationem (qua vitam Suam in nos transfundit



than if it penetrated into our bones and marrows) in the supper, and not indeed in a void or empty sign ... Nor is there ground for the objection which a man may make, that this is figurative speaking, by which the name of a thing signified may be given over to the sign ... We yet rightly gather from the exposition of the symbol that the thing itself [Christ's body] is truly furnished to us. When we have received the token of His body, let us surely trust that the body itself is no less given to us... Elsewhere I confess that the breaking of the bread is a symbol and not the thing itself.

P. 370. "Let nothing be feignedly given to His body which is not accordant to a human nature; and this is done when it is either said to be infinite or when it is [said to be] put in very many places. But taking away these absurdities, whatever is (needed) to express a *true and substantial* communication of the Lord's body and blood I willingly receive.... [P. 371.] This is the whole question, whether it be unlawful for it to be called up to shew its genuine sense.

P. 9. "With one voice, then, we all confess that a partaking of the *substance* of the body and blood of Christ truly takes place. How that takes place some can define better than others, and some more clearly explain. I wish to say this, since no formula has been published ... but that will happen when God may will that all

---

Christus non secus ac si in ossa et medullas penetraret) in cœnâ etiam testatur, et quidem non objecto inani aut vacuo signo...nec est, *quod obijciat quisquam*, figuratam esse locutionem quâ signatæ rei nomen signo deferatur [which Augustine taught]...a symboli tamen expositione rem ipsam *exhiberi* rite colligimus...accepto corporis symbolo non minus *corpus etiam ipsum* dari certo confidamus. [And yet he put in at the last break Fateor fractionem panis symbolum esse non rem ipsam.]

P. 370. § 19.

Nequid ejus corpori affingatur humanæ naturæ minus consentaneum, quod fit dum vel infinitum esse dicitur vel in pluribus simul locis ponitur. Cæterum his absurditatibus sublatiis, quicquid ad exprimendam *veram substantialemque corporis et sanguinis Domini communicationem*, &c. libenter recipio. P. 371, § 22. Totum hoc agitur, an nefas sit de genuino sensu suscitari.

*De Cœnâ Domini, Vol. IX., P. 9, translated into Latin, 1545,  
at first in French.*

Uno igitur ore fatemur omnes...*substantiæ corporis et sanguinis Christi vere fieri participationem*. Quomodo id fiat alii aliis melius definire et clarius explicare possunt. Hoc dictum volui, quoniam nulla publicata est formula...verum hoc fiet quum Deus volet in unum eos

those should meet together by whom these are to be put together. ...To this unhappy disputation I wish to put an end, or at least in the meantime to prepare for its being altogether finished.

P. 248. "For a true consensus, regarding the Lord's supper, by a mutual consent of the ministers of the Zurich Church and of Ds John Calvin minister of the church of Geneva, in the matter of the sacrament, now put forth by their own authorities, 1554.

XVII. "By this doctrine is overthrown that sophists' comment which says that the sacraments of the new law confer [*i.e.* give or bestow] grace on all who do not put the obstacle of mortal sin in the way. For besides that nothing is received in the sacraments but by faith, it must also be held that God's grace is never tied to [the sacraments] themselves, &c.

XIX. "Christ communicates to us in the supper, who had yet previously shared Himself among us and perpetually remains in us. [XX.] But especially must be taken away any imagination whatever of a local presence [of Christ's body]. Christ as far as He is a man is nowhere else than in heaven, nor is to be looked for otherwise than by the mind and by a believing understanding.

XXII. "Further we repudiate as preposterous interpreters those who urge the precisely literal sense of the solemn words in

convenire omnes a quibus hæc sunt componenda...Huic infelici disputationi finem imponere aut saltem eam parare interim, dum omnino finiatur.

P. 248.

Pro vero consensu de cœnâ Domini, consensu mutuo in re sacramentariâ ministrorum Tigurinæ Eccles. et Di. J. Calvini ministri Gen. Eccles. jam nunc ab ipsis auctoribus edita, 1554.

*Latin. Conf. Helvet. XVII.*

Hâc doctrinâ evertitur illud sophistarum commentum quod dicit sacramenta novæ legis *conferre gratiam* omnibus non ponentibus obicem peccati mortalibus. Præter quam enim quod in sacramentis nihil nisi fide percipitur, tenendum quoque est nunquam alligatam ipsis esse Dei gratiam, &c.

XIX.

In cœnâ &c. nobis communicat Christus, Qui tamen Se nobis prius impertierat et perpetuo manet in nobis. XX. Præsertim vero tollenda est *quælibet localis præsentia* (corporis Christi) *imaginatio*. Christus, *quatenus homo est, non alibi quam in cælo*, nec aliter quam mente et fidei intelligentiâ quærendus est.

XXII.

Porro qui in solennibus cœnæ verbis, Hoc est corpus Meum, precise liberalem sensum urgent, eos tanquam præposteros interpretes repudia-

the supper 'This is My Body.' For we lay down as beyond controversy that they are to be figuratively received, so that loaves and wine are called (by Christ) that which they signify, by the figure Metonymy. [xxiii.] But that Christ feeds us by our eating His flesh, that is not as if any [bodily] substance were made by commixture, &c. [xxiv.]...For neither do we judge it less absurd to put Christ under bread, or to couple Him with bread, than to transubstantiate bread into His body. [xxv.] Christ's body, according to the nature and measure of a human body, is finite, and is contained in the Heaven as its [present] place. [xxvi.] Much less is it allowed to pay adoration towards this (flesh). They make an idol of it.

VI. 291. Matt. xxvi. "At its highest point consecration is nothing else than a sacred testimony, by which God fixes an earthly and corruptible sign for a spiritual use.

VII. 184. 1 Cor. xi. "I do not admit that they who bring to the table only an historic faith without a living sense of penitence and faith, receive anything else than a sign.

P. 173. 1 Cor. x. 16. "For neither do I assent to those that here understand benediction as giving of thanks, and who explain to bless as to give thanks. I confess indeed that it is sometimes put in the sense; but never in that construction which Paul has used here. To bless...to consecrate for this use, that it may be a sign to us of the blood of the Lord."

mus. Nam extra controversiam ponimus *figurate recipienda esse*, ut esse panes et vinum dicantur id quod significant, per metonymiam. xxiii. Quod autem carnis Sux esu, &c. Christus animas nostras, &c. pascit, id non quasi aliqua fiat substantia commixtu, &c. xxiv....neque enim minus absurdum judicamus Christum sub pane locare, vel *cum pane copulare*, quam panem transubstantiare in corpus Ejus. xxv. Corpus Christi, ut fert humani corporis natura et modus, finitum est, et cœlo, ut loco continetur. xxvi. Multo minus Eum licet in pane adorare. Idolum ex eo faciunt.

*Harmon. VI. p. 291.*

Matt. xxvi. 26, &c. &c. In summâ nihil aliud est consecratio quam solenne testimonium, quo nobis terrestre et corruptibile signum Dominus in spiritualem usum destinat.

*VII. 184.*

1 Cor. xi. 23, &c. Non admitto, eos qui fidem historicam tantum sine vivo pœnitentiæ et fidei sensu afferunt aliud quam signum accipere.

*P. 173.*

1 Cor. x. 16, Neque enim iis assentior qui hic benedictionem gratiarum actionem intelligunt, et benedicere exponunt gratias agere. Fateor quidem interdum hoc sensu poni: sed nunquam in ea constructione qua hic usus est Paulus. Benedicere...in hunc usum consecrare, ut nobis sit symbolum sanguinis Domini.

(N.) ROGER ASCHAM. B. 1515. D. 1568.

Everyone recalls the story of his going to see Lady Jane Grey and finding her engaged with Plato in the original Greek, and her telling him that she far preferred that employment to the pleasure of hunting in the park. Hume refers to Ascham's works as his authority for that story. But all histories tell of Ascham being the appointed preceptor of Greek to Queen Elizabeth. Cambridge has the honour of having led him into the Greek language. He was of St John's: but it was the refugees from captured Constantinople that were his teachers. He took his degree of B.A. at 16, and that of M.A. at 22, and at 31 he was made Public Orator, having in the meanwhile cultivated the musical art to a great extent as well as mathematical science. The English use of the bow was urged in a treatise which brought him a pension of ten pounds a year from King Edward. In 1548, when he was 33, the early Protestant bias of his mind, which had brought some trouble on him in the first part of his career at the University, drew him into a disputation against the mass. Possibly this recommended him at Court. At any rate before two years, he became tutor to the young king and to the lady Elizabeth, and her Latin secretary in 1558, when she ascended the throne. His death ten years after, at the early age of 53, arose from overtaxing his strength in the production of a poem for presentation to her. His Latin style speaks for itself in these extracts: and his translations of Greek authors were of great service to England: but his reputation as a promoter of the study of that language in this country is hardly surpassed by his accurate judgment and his powerful appeals in behalf of Reformed doctrine. Were it not for some few and small weak parts in this treatise, its republication at the present day might be thought extremely desirable. It might stand well by the side of the Oxford Theses of Thomas Rainolds, Savonarola's Golden Book, Berengarius' Answer to Lanfranc, and some portion at least of Antoine Arnauld's Answers to the Jesuit Nouet on Frequent Communion. These five might constitute a precious string of remedies against one of the prevalent doctrinal disorders of our time.

*The apology of Roger Ascham, &c. &c.*

P. 27. "If a fair judge were to read the Gospel and to read the Missal and to discern how much they differ the one from the other, he might also give a decision on this our controversy. If he were to observe Christ sitting with His disciples, with so much humility, with so much simplicity, in altogether open conversation, and breaking bread to each one and handing the cup to each one, and giving order that they should also do so and keep this His last will, and not like will-makers change it by adding or subtracting: if, I say, such a judge were to consider with his own mind seriously Christ doing these things seriously, and then see opposite [to Him] a priest of our time creeping forth alone out of the sacristy to the altar, and standing there alone with his back to the people, with vestments like a player, with mimic gesticulations, in emulation of apes, and whispering I know not what to himself with impious profanations, giving [the elements] to himself, distributing [them] to himself, doing all to himself in the most private in the most secret way and alone eating all by himself; come thou, anyone who seest a priest of our time and hast ever contemplated Christ in the Gospel, answer in good faith, whether thou canst recognize Christ in our mass. I know of a surety such a fair person would answer 'Lo all has been made anew: certainly these massers are will-makers; they make additions, they diminish, 'they change the will of the Lord, to bring in their own.' If it is the will of the Lord, why change ye it? &c.

---

*Apologia Rogeri Aschami pro cœnâ Dominicâ contra missam et ejus præstigias in Academia olim Cantabrigiense exercitationis gratiâ inchoata, p. 27. London, 1578.*

Si æquus judex legeret evangelium, legeret missale, et quantum inter se discrepent, perspiceret, de hac nostrâ controversiâ facile statueret. Si inspectaret Christum sedentem cum discipulis, cum tantâ humilitate, cum tantâ simplicitate apertum plane sermonem habentem, frangentem panem inter singulos, et poculum porrigentem singulis, præcipientem ut illi etiam sic facerent, et hoc testamentum Ejus ultimum servarent, et non, tanquam testamentarii, diminuendo et addendo mutarent: si Christum, inquam, hoc serio agentem serio animo suo versaret, et e regione cerneret sacerdotem nostratem solum proreptantem ex sacrario ad altare et illic stantem solum, aversum a populo, cum vestibus histrionicis, gesticulationibus mimicis, emulationibus simiacis, et prophanationibus impiis, murmurantem nescio quid sibi, dantem sibi, distribuentem sibi, privatissime secretissime omnia agentem sibi, et solum omnia devorantem sibi; age tu, quisquis es, qui nostratem sacerdotem cernis, et Christum in evangelio unquam contemplatus es, responde bonâ fide, si in nostrâ missâ Christum agnoscere potes. Responderet talis æquus vir, certo scio, "Ecce omnia facta sunt nova: profecto hi missatores testamentarii sunt; "superaddunt, diminuunt, mutant testamentum Domini, ut suum inducerent." Si testamentum Domini est, quare mutatis? &c.

P. 46. "You use the Lord's supper after your own manner. You add also adoration of the sacrament, perhaps with no ill intent, but whether God wills this, you do not know; and you know certainly that God has not commanded it. But he that does what God does not command, especially in the invention of a new worship...let him beware lest those punishments be hanging over him, that God always prepares for the inventors of new modes of adoration. But if you will take my advice, omit such praying as unskilful piety has taught you to use, and begin only to embrace that which most certain truth has instituted. Omit your excess of worship, which has very often been displeasing [to God], and follow Christ's perfect institution, which gives us positive security; for he that holds what Christ ordered, he that observes what He taught, he that does what He did, although he adds nothing of his own, may yet understand that he is pleasing Christ. The priest lifts it up: the people adore it, &c. &c.

P. 60. "How is the sabbath kept holy in England, at least in the greatest part of England? What is the only religion that is reigning? What religion commands the times, the days, the men? To what do men run together in crowds? To hear God's word? Many seldom hear it. Still more do not desire to hear it. Most despise it. All certainly hear in a state of sloth and languor. But what is that in which alone we spend day by day without being satisfied and long ages without dislike, and set the citadel

P. 46.

Tu uteris cœnâ Dominicâ more tuo. Addis etiam adorationem sacramenti, non malo fortasse proposito; sed an Deus hoc vult necis: et quod Deus hoc non jussit certo scis. At qui facit quod Deus non jubet, potissimum in novo cultu excogitando,...caveat ne illa supplicia ei immineant, quæ Deus novæ adorationis inventoribus semper præparat. At si meum consilium sequeris, omitte orare quod imperita pietas docuit, et incipe solum amplexari quod certissima veritas instituit. Omitte nimiam tuam pietatem, quæ sæpissime displicuit, et sequere perfectam Christi institutionem, quæ certam securitatem habet: nam qui tenet quod Christus monuit, qui observat quod docuit, qui facit quod Ille facit, etiamsi de suo nihil addat, se tamen Christo placere intelligat. Sacerdos elevat, populus adorat, &c. &c. P. 57, on using an unknown tongue.

P. 60.

Quomodo sanctificatur Sabbatum in Angliâ, vel saltem in maximâ parte Angliæ? Quæ sola religio regnat? Cui re'ligioni serviunt tempora dies homines? Ad quid concursus hominum fit? Ad audiendum verbum Dei? Multi raro audiunt. Plures non desiderant. Plurimi contemnunt. Universi cum socordiâ certe et languore audiunt. At in quâ unâ re singulos dies sine satietate, longissima sæcula sine fastidio, con-

of our religion in it? Is it not in hearing mass? Is it not in seeing mass? Does not the mass alone cause other things to be all set aside? &c. &c. If the mass, if the mass alone be not that religion which alone Englishmen long for, why are men endured as priests, who cannot profess to perform any other religion than the mass? The priests alone present religion to the people; but they are conversant with no part of religion but the mass. Therefore it is clear that hardly any religion is left in England except the mass. And I say not this to set forth the fact, for it is most manifestly seen; but for the purpose of uttering my complaint about the calamity which is most deplorable; and in this thing my words are shorter and more languid than the exceeding greatness of the wickedness demands: for let us go through all the parishes of England, let us enter the houses of the great, of lawyers and even of bishops, and do not all reckon that Christ's religion has been honourably established in their homes, if they provided for them some masser however unlearned? Do they care to have any other trace of Christian doctrine taught? And while the people is lying down in such deep sleep, while the priests have so complete an ignorance around them, while the bishops see this, while the highest magistrates suffer this, surely either there is no God at all in the heaven, or so intolerable a state of things will be punished on earth. And what is it which now and formerly brought in and so long kept this ignorance in concealment? Only the mass. For while the mass alone satisfies everyone, all have cast off the care of true religion. The sabbath of the Lord was not kept holy. Nearly all

---

sumimus, et arcem religionis nostræ collocamus? Annon in missâ audiendâ? Annon in missâ videndâ? Annon sola missa facit ut cætera omnia missa fiant? &c., &c. Si missa, si sola missa non sit ea religio, quam Angli solam expetunt, quare sacerdotes tolerantur, qui nullam aliam religionem quam missam profiteri possunt? Soli sacerdotes religionem populo afferunt; sed in nullâ parte religionis versantur quam in missâ. Ergo nulla alia fere religio quam missa reliqua est in Angliâ. Et hoc non dico ad explicationem rei quæ manifestissima est, sed ad questionem calamitatis, quæ deploratissima est; in quâ re et brevior et languidior sum quam tanti sceleris magnitudo postulat: nam peragremus omnes parochias Angliæ, intremus ædes magnatum leguleiorum et etiam episcoporum, annon omnes pulchre sibi constitutam esse religionem Christi autumant, si indoctum missatorem sibi comparaverint? An ullum aliud vestigium Christianæ doctrinæ docendum curant? Et cum in tanto somno jacet populus, cum tantâ ignorantîâ circumfusi sunt sacerdotes, cum hoc vident episcopi, cum hoc patiuntur magistratus summi, profecto aut nullus Deus est in cœlo, aut tanta intolerantia vindicabitur in terra. Et quid est quod tantam ignorantiam jam et olim invexit et tandiu texit in Angliâ? Sola missa. Nam dum sola missa satisfacit omnibus, omnes abjecerunt curam veræ religionis. Sabbatum Domini non sanctificabatur. Vias suas non voluntatem Domini

have followed their own ways and not the Lord's will. The word and God's very holy mysteries [in it] have been neglected. The offices of mutual charity have become unknown...Thus everywhere the mass alone was in dominancy in the place of true religion...But he has called up in these times men of God to purge away these foulnesses of the mass, and to restore Christ's religion to its old splendour. To this our Josiah directs his way, to this the noble Somerset...to this our most noble princess Katherine, and Elizabeth too, &c. &c.

P. 63. "Hand over to me a crowd of priests, and just for a time take away the mass. What would they do? Would they teach? They have learned nothing. Shall they preach? Why they can scarce read straight on. What then can they do? Only perform mass. For the mass alone is their common inn, for it receives and feeds many useless priests; and it has also rejected and shut out from the church of God many fit ministers of the word and the mysteries, for they being unable to endure the abominations of the mass, betook themselves to another kind of life as to another home. And thus these blind guides have led the people along into this present darkness and night, in which they sleep sound and feel nothing except that they have an empty delight in their dream of the mass."

[If the above be a true historical picture, it proclaims a loud warning to the men of the present age.]

*omnes fere sequuti sunt...Verbum et sacrosancta mysteria Dei neglecta sunt. Officia mutue charitatis incognita sunt...Sic ubique loco vere religionis sola missa dominabatur...Excitavit autem his temporibus homines Dei qui has fœditates missæ repurgarent et religionem Christi in veterem splendorem restituerent. Huc Josias noster intendit, huc nobilis Somersetensis...huc nobilissima princeps Caterina, et Elizabetha, &c. &c.*

*P. 63.*

Da mihi turbam sacerdotum et summove missam ad tempus. Quid facerent? Docerent? Nihil didicerunt. Concionabuntur? Imo vix legere explorare possunt. Quid possunt igitur? Solum missare. Sola enim missa diversorium commune est, quod recipit et alit multos inutiles sacerdotes quæ sola etiam rejecit et exclusit ab ecclesiâ Dei multos aptos ministros verbi et mysteriorum, qui abominaciones missæ non ferentes, in aliud vitæ genus, tanquam in aliud domicilium, concesserunt. Et sic hi duces cæci perduxerunt populum Dei in has tenebras et noctem, ubi alte dormiunt et nihil sentiunt, nisi quod somnio missæ inaniter oblectantur.



(O.) BISHOP JOHN JEWEL, *first of Merton, then of C.C.C.*  
*Oxford.* B. 1522. D. 1571.

Who does not think of "the trusty staff that Jewel gave To youthful Hooker in familiar style, The gift exalting and with playful smile"? Then comes the saying of Dean Moren of Merton, "I should love thee if thou wert not a Zuinglian ... Surely in thy life thou art an angel ... but a Lutheran." Then we have scenes, in which Peter Martyr is as father and Jewel a son, when Martyr disputed against Chedsey and others before King Edward's Commissioners. Then his affecting farewell to his college when he "went for his life" with the rest. Then on his return his figure stands up before Harding in an immortal struggle, or our eye rests on him constantly preaching, and ruling his diocese, and justifying his too great toil to his friends because preachers existed not in sufficient number, and the sheep must be fed. The honour of his birth is with Devonshire. His Apology and his Defence will for ever keep alive the memory of the doctrinal position taken by the Reformed Church of England. What can surpass his last address, surpassing as it does his early address to his college? This is a part of it: "I see I am now to go the way of all flesh; and I feel the arrows of death already fastened in my body ... It was my prayer always unto Almighty God, since I had any understanding, that I might honour His name with the sacrifice of my flesh, and confirm His truth with the oblation of this my body unto death in the defence thereof; which seeing He hath not granted me, yet I somewhat rejoice, and solace myself that it is worn out and exhausted in the labours of my calling." The whole account of the death-bed scene is most touching and edifying.

*On the Sacraments.* Parker Society.

P. 1109. "I will shew the use and order and faith of the primitive church which was in the times of the apostles and of Tertullian, Cyprian, Basil, Nazianzene, Hierome, Augustine, Chrysostom, and other catholic and godly learned fathers. Let no man regard me or my speech. I am only a finger. These are clear bright stars. I do but shew them unto you and point them that you *may* behold them. God give us grace that we may see them truly, and *by them* be able to guide and to direct our way.

P. 111. "Christ says ye shall not eat this body that ye see, neither shall ye drink that blood that they shall shed that shall

crucify Me. I have recommended unto you a certain sacrament. Being spiritually understood it will give you life. Even so Chrysostom, What is it that He saith? The flesh profiteth nothing. He speaketh it not of flesh indeed. God forbid, &c., &c. Cyril, He gave fragments of bread to His disciples. John, Bk. iv. c. 14 and c. 10. See ad object. Theod. Anath. II. Chrysostom, That nature of bread remains in the sacrament. Ambrose, That those things which were may (still) be; and may be changed into another thing. How much more operative is the word of God, Sermo Dei! Jerome, That cup which is a creature (i.e. the wine). Justin, They distribute of the bread in which thanks were given. Bertram, According to the substance of creatures, what they were before consecration, that they afterwards continue. Clement, He shews that was wine which He blessed. [Note. I have given these in English, not thinking much can be proved by short sayings picked out like individual stones from the walls of the fathers' building.]

P. 1116. "The bread and the wine remain in their proper nature. So is it avouched by our Saviour. [A long list of short extracts from St Paul down to Rabanus: and with the exception of the first opposite extracts can be taken from the quotations of almost all in this volume.]

P. 1118. "Vigilius of Tapsus. When (the flesh of Christ) was on earth, it was not in heaven, and now because it is in heaven it is not also on earth, non est utique in terrâ. Cont. Eutych. II. [P. 1119.] Jerome. When we hear the Lord's speech, the flesh of Christ and His blood is being poured (infunditur) into our ears. Jn. vi., Ps. cxlvii.

P. 1122. "Round figures and a thing imperceptible as to power (quantum ad potentiam). Epiph. in Ancor. Aug. de Trin. III. 10. To have honour for them not stupefaction (stuporem), tanquam mira non possunt. [P. 1123.] Controversy with Harding. Scotus and Innocent III. and certain others say that this word 'benedixit' worketh consecration. The common opinion is that it is wrought by the words 'This is My body.' Some think that Christ spake these words *twice*: first *secretly*, to Himself, and afterward openly, that the apostles might understand Him, Besarion. But the Greek church thinketh the consecration is not wrought by these words, but by the prayer of the priest which followeth afterwards. Christ said not, 'Say ye this,' or 'By these words go and transubstantiate or change natures,' St Paul, 1 Cor. xi. This is well noted and opened by St Augustine. Put the words of God to the elements, and it is made a sacrament. Not, because it is spoken, but because it is believed. The word of faith which we preach (saith St A.), not the word which we whisper in secret, is the word of consecration.

*Defence of the Apology.* Vol. III. Ch. XIII. § 7.

"We affirm that the bread and wine are the holy and heavenly mysteries [*i.e.* signs or sacraments] of the body and blood of Christ, and that by them Christ Himself, being the true [*i.e.* antitypical] bread of eternal life, is so presently given unto us that by faith we *verily* receive His body and blood."

If the reader will refer to the extracts from Hugh Latimer's last public appearing at Oxford before his death, he will there see the danger of using this ambiguous word "*verily*" in relation to Christ's body and blood, except in the usual almost universal sense in which it is used in this controversy, *viz.* not the sense of antitypical or spiritual, but in the sense in which our Church says, "the true natural body of Christ is in heaven and not here." It will have been found by the reader of the extracts in this book that the sense of "a body according to nature" is used many dozen times for one use of it in Jewel's sense in this passage; and if clearness is the *sine quâ non* in a complicated controversy like this of the Lord's supper, is it not to be lamented that Jewel used the cognate words "really present" respecting Christ's spiritual and heavenly present aid? Yea, that our renowned champion Jewel uses "*verily* receive Christ's body "and blood" in the same manner? The ill consequences are to be traced down to the Archbishops Tillotson and Wake, and also since. If two hostile armies persist in using different flags for the same signal, must it not create confusion to both sides, and hinder the fair conclusion of the campaign?

"That was not Christ's meaning that the wheaten bread should lay apart his (*i.e.* its) own nature and receive a certain new Divinity; but that He might rather change us, and, to use Theophylact's words, *transform* us into His body [see p. 491]. For as he saith, We are *transelemented* or transnated and changed into Christ: *even so* and none otherwise we say, The bread is transelemented or changed into Christ's body."

This may be termed seizing the weapons of corrupt doctrine to beat it down; which is always a dangerous and often a very hurtful trick: and so here. For if a Theophylactine disciple turns round and says "You confess that your body's very elements are "changed into the elements of Christ's body; and that is just "what the eating of Christ's very body does for us, and nothing "but His body can change our bodily elements; therefore you

"admit that it is His true natural body that we all receive," then I say we begin to wish we had never set foot in that path at all. But is it true in fact that Christ does in any sense trans-  
element our bodies by the Lord's supper? Is there a hint of any bodily change whatever in us through this sacrament? If not, surely it is better to cast out the word "transelemented" *altogether*.

"For what can be said more plainly than that which St Ambrose saith, 'Bread and wine remain still the same as they were before; and yet are changed into another thing'? or that which Gelasius saith, 'The substance of the bread or the 'nature of the wine ceaseth not to be'?"

It will be seen by reference to Ambrose that the quotation is not exact, but is a sentence made up from different parts of the chapter. But perhaps one ought to notice the plan too common in the English Reformers of quoting only a very small fragment from a father, just as if it were transferred from a commonplace book of scraps, without referring to the original, and thus omitting to notice, as occurs in this case of Ambrose, that the general drift, and in fact nearly all the rest of the chapter, goes strongly the other way. Then to the next quotation, that from Gelasius, nearly the same remark applies: and thus it is that our Reformers' writings are now held in very low estimation by such Germans as Dr Döllinger. In fact the only course to be followed regarding the fathers is to give up using them as partisans, and to be careful to produce them fairly and to reason from them justly. The other three quotations from Augustine, Theodoret and Origen are fairly taken and justly reasoned from: for they are among almost the most Protestant of the fathers. The results of my own researches place indeed Theodore and Athanasius before them, and Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian in their company. If this be true their favourable sayings have few counter-sayings that need to be alluded to: though this can hardly be said of Augustine.

I cite but one more passage of Jewel to shew yet more plainly his line of argument regarding this sacrament. It is to Jewel's credit now as always that his words distinctly express his meaning, nor is there any sleight-of-hand in his reasoning.

P. 449, c. xi. § 1. "And we do expressly pronounce that in the Lord's supper there is *truly* given into the believing the body and blood of our Lord, *the flesh of the Son of God* (which *must*

*needs be the flesh of His humanity, since to talk of the flesh of His Godhead either in reality or in a figure were intolerable), which quickeneth our souls, the meat that cometh from above, the food of immortality, of grace, truth and life: and that the same supper is the communion of the body and blood of Christ by the partaking whereof, κοινωνία, we be revived, ζωοποιούμεθα strengthened and fed unto immortality, and whereby we are formed, united, and incorporate into Christ, that we may abide in Him and He in us."*

I give this passage entire, because this and the previous extract, of which I have treated, constitute the keystone of the Apology in relation to this subject. The Greek is inserted by me as being the corresponding patristic terms. The whole is put with consummate skill, as is all the Apology; the only question being how far it is right to set down all this exegesis of the idea without one hint that it is only in a figurative, tropical, or metaphorical sense that "the bread" is called "the Lord's body." Yet this and nothing less is the real point at issue between us and the corrupt churches who hold that it is changed into Christ's true natural body. Besides this the only charge against Jewel is that he very strongly inclines to making out that almost all the strong expressions in the fathers on this subject bear simply a spiritual meaning. And all that I desire in this book is to put either all that every leading author says on this subject, or, if his writings be too copious to allow of this, an amply sufficient quantity of large extracts to enable every reader to judge for himself regarding every leading writer, whether each one, on the whole, or entirely gives his vote and influence in favour of the one side, which the Church of England has on the whole very decidedly adopted, or on the other, against which she *protests* as a protesting or Protestant church.

(P.) CORNELIUS JANSEN, BISHOP OF GHENT AND PROFESSOR OF LOUVAIN. B. 1510. D. 1576.

See life of the later Jansenius, his nephew.

P. 458. "But that both this passage, John vi., 'Unless ye eat,' &c. and that on the last supper must not be understood of

---

P. 458. Leyden, 1580.

Verum de hujusmodi carne, aut corpore mystico (i. e. the church) et hunc locum (John vi. Unless, &c.) et illum in ultimâ cœnâ non esse

flesh of this kind or the mystic body, but (that they were spoken) of the true and properly so called flesh of the Lord, is manifest from its being here said, 'The bread which I will give is my flesh,' i.e. my body; but it is added, 'which will be given for you:' and by these additions it is manifest that He spake concerning that flesh and that body, which was hanged for us on the cross. Nor did Augustine doubt but that Christ's true body was really contained under the sacrament and the appearance of bread, as appears plainly from various passages of his writings [but more in him teaches the opposite]; and to bring forward one out of many, it plainly appears from what he writes on the title of Ps. xxxiii., address I., 'Christ was being borne in His own hands, when commending to 'them His own very body He says, This is My body, &c. For He 'was bearing that body in His own hands.' Thus Augustine; and he also says in the same place that (Christ) spoke of the same body here in John vi. 'Unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of man,' &c. But the reason, why Augustine at some time interpreted this passage of St John, of Christ's mystical body, appears to be this, that he might shew that these sentences of the Saviour belonged to all that are alive, and again that he might shew that they are absolutely true, and that he might exhort the faithful by them unto unity and call them away from schism and heresy. For he was in the habit of seeing many obtain the life of the Spirit, as he was seeing again many infants sacramentally eat the flesh of Christ, but they did not attain to life (by it) as they unworthily received it. He was seeing heretics too and schismatics come in crowds to the sacraments of the Lord's body. Observe

---

intelligendum, sed de *verâ et propriè dictâ carne* Domini manifestum est ex eo quod hic dicitur, "The bread which I will give, &c." hoc est corpus Meum; sed additur "quod pro vobis tradetur." Quibus additionibus manifestum fit Eum de eâ carne et eo corpore locutum, quod pro nobis in cruce est suspensum. Nec dubitavit Aug. quin *reverd* Christi corpus *verum* contineretur sub sacramento et specie panis, quemadmodum ex variis locis scripturarum ejus patet: et ut ex multis unum proferamus, patet ex illo quod scribit super titulo Ps. xxxiii., concione i., "Ferebatur Christus in manibus Suis, quando commendans *ipsum corpus* "*Suum* ait, Hoc est. Ferebat enim corpus illud in manibus Suis." Hæc ille, qui et eodem loco dicit, de eodem corpore locutum esse hic apud Johannem vi., Unless ye, &c. Quod autem quandoque hunc locum Johannis Aug. interpretatus est de corpore Christi mystico, ratio videtur fuisse ista, ut sententias has Salvatoris ostenderet ad omnes pertinere qui vivunt, et rursum eas ostenderet absolute veras esse, ac per eas ad unitatem fideles hortaretur, atque a schismate et hæresi avocaret. Videbat enim multos habere vitam Spiritus (by baptism), ut infantes videbat rursum multos *sacramentaliter carnem Domini manducare*; qui vitam non assequerentur, *ut indigne sumentes*. Videbat et hæreticos et schismaticos sacramenta corporis Domini frequentare. Proinde attendens

further that the body of Christ is twofold; of which each is the thing in the sacrament of the eucharist, but the one is a thing signified and truly contained in it, the other is a thing signified indeed, but not contained in it...It seemed fit to him to explain opinions of this kind regarding Christ's mystic body, that he who had been in any way incorporated into it, had obtained the fruit of it, but that he who had not been incorporated, neither had he obtained the fruit though he had received the sacrament itself. [It is only fair to Jerome to trace the frequent occurrence of this very important distinction of his in doctors no more enlightened than this Jansen of Ghent. The one notable passage in Jerome must be fresh in everyone's remembrance.] But to our subject... It remains that all this passage be most consistently understood concerning spiritual eating (which is through faith) of the flesh which was delivered up for us on the cross and the blood shed for us (and this is the fourth mode of eating the Lord's flesh), and that it be understood of this is fully required by the preceding and succeeding context: and if it also be understood of this, all the difficulties cease, which arise if it be understood of sacramental eating. Certainly Augustine on Christian Doctrine, III. 16, teaches that we must understand of spiritual eating 'He that cometh to me shall never hunger, &c.,' where beyond doubt he is not speaking of receiving the sacrament of the eucharist; but he is saying that hunger and thirst are taken away by the alone act of faith; and further we are said by the alone act of faith both to eat and to drink...[P. 459.] Under the sacrament of bread and wine are truly continued to us [in unbroken order] the flesh and blood of Christ."

It is worthy of notice how much more light shines in this divine's writing, after the notable distinction by Jerome has

---

*duplex esse corpus Christi; quorum utrumque est res sacramenti eucharistiæ; sed alterum res significata et vere contenta, alterum res significata quidem, sed non contenta...visum est ei hujusmodi sententias explicare de corpore Christi mystico, quod, qui illi quovis modo incorporatus esset fructum sit assecutus; qui vero non [i.e. incorporatus], nec fructum est assecutus, etiamsi sacramentum ipsum perceperisset. Sed ad rem...Restat totum hunc locum convenientissime intelligi de manducatione spirituali (quæ est per fidem) in carnem traditam in cruce et sanguinem effusum pro nobis (qui est quartus modus manducandi carnem Domini) de quo ut intelligatur et præcedentia et sequentia satis exigunt, et de quo si intelligatur, cessant omnes difficultates, quæ oriuntur, si de sacramentali manducatione accipiatur. Certe de spirituali manducatione esse intelligendum docet Aug., III. c. 16, de doct. Christ., "He that cometh to Me shall never hunger, &c.," ubi procul dubio non loquitur de perceptione sacramenti eucharistiæ, sed unico actu fidei dicit et famem tolli et sitim, ac proinde unico actu fidei dicimur et manducare et bibere. P. 459. Sub sacramento panis et vini vere continuatur caro Christi et sanguis.*

flashed across his mind afresh. I wonder how many such disciples of Augustine the Council of Trent comprised—possessors of the bifarian speech of that great but not clear divine.

(Q.) WOLFGANG MUSCULUS. B. 1497. D. 1563.

Andrew Musculus was born 17 years later. Wolfgang was a native of Lorraine. His father was a cooper. His skill in commenting on the Scriptures, chiefly on the New Testament, is so great, that a modern writer on St John says that it is hardly possible to say anything good on St John which is not to be found in this author. He was sent out like Luther to sing in the streets and beg for his sustenance from door to door. This is said to have been appointed by parents in order to teach their sons self-denial and activity. His history was that of many. He found favour with a prior, and he read some of Luther's books. His heart was touched by God's Spirit and he gave himself to the preaching of Christ's truth both among the poor and the rich. He was threatened by the governor of a castle in the Palatiné: who, when he found Musculus beyond fear, gave him his friendship and protection. Mentz, Strasburg, and Augsburg were the chief scenes of his honest and affectionate preaching. In the last of the three he laboured 18 years. He preached boldly, against much opposition, during the critical council held by Charles V. at Augsburg. And when the Emperor's "Interim," a book of church rules adverse to Protestantism, was accepted by the senate, he left the city and, after some wandering and an invitation to England, settled at Berne and gave to it his last 14 years. John Haller was his friend and guide during a large part of his life. He wrote against Cochläus who wrote against everybody.

Andrew Musculus was a Lutheran minister and Professor at Frankfort-on-the-Oder. He wrote against Osiander who made justification inherent. This Musculus went to the full extent of Lutheranism regarding the Real Presence, fully believing in the ubiquity of Christ's natural and glorified human body. He helped in framing the formula of concord. But one of his books is in refutation of any physical localization of Christ's glorified body. In a word this short notice is enough without any extracts from his writings. He wrote also on free-will. He was a hot polemic,



and was hotly answered by his antagonists. He was born at Schneeberg in Meissen and studied at Leipsic and Wittenberg: see Döllinger, *La Réforme*, a valuable repertory of fresh matter regarding the German Reformers. Andrew Musculus is much less celebrated than his namesake Wolfgang; whose very countenance seems to breathe peace and to express integrity and quiet courage. Andrew died 1581. Many of his controversial works survive.

P. 84. *Gal.* "Yet one will say, Can (righteousness) be said to be from the sacraments equally as from the law? If righteousness is from the sacraments, baptism and the supper of the Lord, has Christ died in vain? I briefly answer, It is not the signs of Christ's death, but the death itself, by which our sins have been blotted out, that justifies. But sacraments are not the death of Christ, but signs of the death of Christ added to the word [or preaching] of the cross. Therefore sacraments do not justify. We are baptized into the death of Christ, and in the supper of the Lord we celebrate Christ's death; but the virtue of the death of Christ, by which we are justified, is not apprehended by the outward use of the sacraments but by faith alone. Wherefore some have rightly written that not the sacraments but the faith of the sacraments justifies.

P. 243. 1 *Thess.* "It is of much consequence how we receive the word of God. For though the Gospel is in itself not the word of men but of God, yet it is not the word of God to them who receive it not as the word of God but as the word of men. In like manner it is not enough to receive God's sacraments, unless you receive them as God's sacraments—that is to say with that

*Ep. ad Galatas*, p. 84. Basil, 1561.

Adhuc dicet quisquam, Possitne de sacramentis perinde atque de lege dici (justitia)? Si per sacramenta, baptismum et cœnam Domini est justitia, ergo Christus frustra est mortuus? Breviter respondeo, Non symbola mortis Christi, sed mors ipsa, quâ peccata nostra deleta sunt, justificat. Sacramenta vero non sunt mors Christi sed mortis Christi symbola, sermoni crucis adjecta. Ergo sacramenta nonificant. Baptizamus quidem in mortem Christi et in cœnâ Domini mortem Christi celebramus, verum virtus mortis Christi, quâ justificamur, non externo sacramentorum usu, sed solâ fide apprehenditur. Quare recte scripserunt nonnulli, non sacramenta, sed sacramentorum fidem justificare.

1 *ad Thess.*, p. 243.

Multum refert quo modo sermonem Dei accipiamus. Licet enim evangelium in se sit sermo non hominum sed Dei illis tamen non est sermo Dei, qui illud non ut Dei sed ut hominum sermonem accipiunt. Consimili modo non est satis accipere sacramenta Dei, nisi ea accipias ut sacramenta Dei—eâ videlicet fide ac religione quâ sacra-

faith and religion with which God's sacraments ought to be received. For though they are in themselves God's sacraments, yet they are uselessly received, yea even to judgment if they are not received in a manner worthy of them as God's sacraments. 1 Tim. The Papists accuse us of rejecting the unity of the church, fasting, good works, &c. We answer them, we know that the unity of the church is good if it be legitimate. We know that fasting is good if it be used without superstition rightly and legitimately. We know that good works please God, if they be done legitimately, not in a feigned faith but in a good conscience. So say we to our brothers also. We know that the bread and cup of the Lord's supper is Christ's body and blood, Christ is everywhere present to us and fills all things; provided these things be received in their sound and legitimate sense. For if they are otherwise understood they are not true but erroneous. Whence also in this age of yours a strife in councils has arisen as, alas! appears....All laws are void without being used, as also doctrine and sacraments. There is a most bitter discussion on the sacraments: in the mean time we see little care regarding their practice. We know that the sacraments instituted by Christ are good, but on this point there is no need for any discussion: but we add—if any one use them sacramentally, *i.e.* as a sacred sign. Otherwise it were better that we were altogether separated from all sacraments. For an abuse of them is not only empty, but also damnable and destructive, even though we contend to the world's end that sacraments are good."

---

menta Dei accipi debent. Etenim licet in se sint sacramenta Dei, inutiliter tamen, immo ad iudicium accipiuntur, si non ut sacramenta Dei condigne accipiantur...1 Timothy. Accusant nos Papistæ quod rejiciamus unitatem ecclesiæ, jejunium, bona opera, &c. &c. Respondemus illis, Scimus quod bona sit unitas ecclesiæ, si sit legitima. Scimus quod bonum sit jejunium, si absque superstitione recte ac legitime usurpetur. Scimus quod Deo placeant bona opera, si ex fide non simulatâ et conscientia bonâ legitime fiat. Sic et fratribus nostris dicimus. Scimus panem ac poculum cœnæ Dominicæ esse corpus et sanguinem Christi, Christum esse nobis ubique præsentem, et adimplere omnia: modo hæc sano ac legitimo sensu accipiuntur. Etenim si secus intelligantur, non vera sunt sed erronea. Unde et nostro hoc seculo concertatio est in conciliabulis, ut proh dolor! apparet, exorta...Sine usu inanes sunt omnes leges, quemadmodum et doctrina et sacramenta. De sacramentis acerbissime disceptatur: de usu illorum modicam interim videmus esse curam. Scimus sacramenta a Christo instituta bona esse, quâ de re non est opus ullâ disceptatione: verum adjicimus—si quis illa sacramentaliter utatur. Alioqui satius esset alienos prorsus esse nos a sacramentis. Est enim abusus illorum non modo inanis, sed et damnabilis et exitiosus, etiam si ad finem mundi usque bona esse sacramenta contendamus.

In Extract I. it might be said Musculus teaches that the Lord's supper is a bare commemoration. Surely no spiritually-minded and orthodox believer in the Gospel ever regarded this sacrament as merely to commemorate Christ's death without the communicant's obtaining grace in the use of it. Certainly no one will affirm that "*bona esse sacramenta*" in the last extract does not refer to grace personally received. In fact the only writers I have found that disjoin the grace signified are Pelagius and Bishop Hoadley, and neither of them denies it. I fancy they believed them useful for obtaining grace. This writer did not take a position as a preacher till 1547, at 50 years of age. It is said that he then began Greek. He was secretary at Ratisbon to the conference between Eck and Melancthon. Cranmer invited him to England. He became Professor at Berne. His *Loci Communes* occupied him 14 years: and he wrote Commentaries on many of St Paul's epistles.

(R.) BISHOP JOHN HOOPER, BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER AND  
WORCESTER. B. 1495. D. 1555.

His name adorns the rolls of Merton College. He is distinguishable for pointed preaching, strong quiet patience, and tenderness of conscience. He gave way about "the habits" after going to prison for them, and he served laboriously and happily as bishop, from the time of the accession of Edward till Gardiner crowned his harsh treatment of Hooper by committing him to the flames. The butt end of the stake near the outside of a churchyard in Gloucester is now replaced by a monument. His last written thoughts are eminent for a sense of unworthiness combined with perfect peace in the prospect of his cruel end. He wrote as well as preached much. The Parker Society (second volume) gives 20 lines that he scratched with a coal on the wall of the New Inn at Gloucester the night before he suffered. His last prayer preserved in the Bodleian Library is most characteristic. I extract the words. "I have counted all things but dung and dross "that I might win Thee (Christ); which death is more dear to me "than thousands of gold and silver. Such love hast Thou laid "up in my breast that I hunger for Thee."

P. 44. "As far as relates to the element's substance, it is bread; as far as relates to the sacrament and the memory of Christ's death, the body of Christ was a mystery (allegory). In substance truly it is bread, but in the mind and in a mystery it is Christ.

P. 152. *Articles of William Phelps, pastor and magistrate of Cirencester, 1551, sixth King Edward.* "As for the eating of His flesh and drinking of His blood really and corporeally and materially or substantially it is but a carnal and gross opinion of men, besides and contrary to the word of God, that affirmeth His corporeal departure from earth and placeth it in Heaven alone at the right hand of God the Father Almighty, and keepeth and retaineth, holdeth and preserveth the same corporeal body of Christ there until the general day of judgment, and the word declareth from thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

*Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's book, p. 127.* "In case the sacraments could give us very Christ, the promise of God were in vain; the which always appertain to the people of God before they receive any sacrament. He that supposeth to make Christ his and all Christ's merits by the receiving of the outward sign and sacrament, and, bringeth not Christ in his heart to the sacrament, he may make himself assured rather of the devil and eternal death. For the sacrament *maketh not* the union and peace and concord between God and us; but it ratifieth establisheth and confirmeth the love and peace that is between God and us before for His promise sake.

P. 225. "I deny any miracle at all to be in the sacrament, but every thing, wrought by God accustomedly by faith, remission of sins and augmentation of God's righteousness and the signs, to remain in their proper nature.

P. 90. "It is a visible word which preacheth peace."

*Vol. II. 44. De vera doctrina et usu cœnæ Domini.*

Quantum ad substantiam elementi, panis est; quantum ad sacramentum et memoriam mortis Christi mysterium corpus Christi erat. In substantiâ vero panis est, in mente autem et mysterio Christus est.

(S.) ARCHBISHOP MATTHEW PARKER. B. 1504. D. 1575.

Born at Norwich. Master of Benet, Cambridge, and Dean of Lincoln. The English Bible was revised under his direction. Because he was a great collector of ecclesiastical records, his name

stamps the Parker Society, which also published his correspondence. It was in 1562 that among other changes the article "on Grace" was dropped; which has diminished the practical bearing of the Articles; for this article contains terms that are a good counterpoise to the other truth in Art. xvii. His favourite motto was, "The world passeth away and the desire thereof." His countenance indicates quiet stability and resolution of purpose. Lambeth Palace was sought by a nobleman. Parker obtained a promise that it should not be alienated while he abode in it. So to secure it to the see for ever he made a vault in the palace to receive his own remains, and to retain the palace for ever.

P. 378. *Archbishop Parker to Sir A. Edcar.* "Sir, as you desired, I send you the form of bread used; and which was so appointed by my late Lord of London (Grindal) and myself.

P. 460. *Do. to Parkhurst.* "As for their contention for wafer-bread and loaf-bread, &c. I trust that you mean not universally in your diocese to command or wink at the loaf-bread but for peace and quietness to be here and there contented therewith.

P. 576. "I expound (the rubric 'To take away the superstition,' &c.). Where either there wanteth such fine 'usual bread,' or (if) *superstition be feared in the wafer-bread*, they may have a communion in the fine usual bread."

(T.) PETER MARTYR, OF THE VERMIGLI FAMILY.

B. 1500. D. 1562.

Born at Florence. Like Luther, he was an Augustinian monk. He was prior at Lucca. Great success had attended the efforts of Zwingel and the churches of Switzerland to spread the Gospel in the north of Italy before the deadly civil war, which terminated Zwingel's life. The Swiss and German light is said thus to have reached Peter Martyr and many others. Meeting in Strasburg with Ochino, who was flying from Charles V. and the Inquisition, Peter brought him with him to England. He had come on the invitation of Cranmer, who in 1540 obtained for him the Professorship of Hebrew at Oxford, and a Christchurch canonry: but Ochino was established in London. When Edward VI. died, they met again at Zurich, where Martyr became Professor of Hebrew and Theology, and frequently preached to Ochino's Italian congre-

gation; who had lost his wife in Oxford. She like Luther's wife had been a nun: but Zurich was the place of his own death. In erudition he is the accepted rival of Calvin. He took part in the conference at Poissy. He seems to have combined singular sweetness with clear and unflinching fidelity. Bullinger loved him as a brother, and closed his dying eyes at Zurich, to which place, in our English Mary's reign, he retired. His wife died soon after him; but as she left an inheritance of poverty to her posthumous daughter, the grateful Senate of Zurich interfered and provided for her. He left to the world his *Loci Communes*, a work on the Lord's Supper, and a collection of letters. The papal writers reckon him a better Latin scholar even than Calvin. Dupin regrets his loss, and says that if he had not left the Roman communion he might have rendered great services to religion and to the state. We may be excused for replying that his secession to the Protestant side enabled him to render great services to the University of Oxford and to the realm of England. His countenance is remarkable for the union of pleasantness and power. The latter is owing in part to a remarkable expansion, not of the forehead alone; for the entire head is unusually massive. Charles V. saw the light in the same year. Peter and his family were named Martyr after a martyr slain at Florence in the Arian troubles. He studied first at Fiesole, then at Padua, the Cambridge of Italy, if Bologna stands for Oxford. He ministered for five years at Strasburg with Bucer, and returned thither when he escaped from England. He died sitting in his chair on the seventh day after the sickness began.

*Common-place Short Epitome. A.D. 1561.*

P. 879. *Disputation at Oxford against Gardiner.* "The words in the supper to be tropically received. Further, the definition of a sacrament, that it is a sign of a sacred thing and the visible form of grace that is not seen, is very greatly on the side of our opinion. For by that publicly received opinion it follows that those things,

---

*Loci Communes. From Class IV., p. 879, § 9. Disputation at Oxford, A.D. 1561. London, 1583.*

(A.) *Verba cœnæ accipienda tropice.* Ipsa porro sacramenti definitio, quod sacræ rei sit signum et gratiæ, quæ non videtur, visibilis forma nostram sententiam maxime propugnat. Efficitur enim ex eâ

which are seen in the eucharist, are the signs of the Lord's body and blood.

P. 878. "First indeed we affirm that in the sacrament of the eucharist the bread and wine (the things which are testified of by the letter of the Divine word, the fathers and the sense itself to be truly present there) are signs of the Lord's body and blood. Our adversaries on the other hand declare that they are properly and truly Christ's body and blood.

P. 879. "The trope in Christ's word makes no real and substantial presence of His body and blood necessary. The Divine Scriptures hand down that Christ as far as concerns His human nature has gone away hence, &c. They assert that Christ said that we should not have Him always with us; but that the Heaven must contain Him up to the last day, that He may then at length come to judgment. It suits not a human body to be at the same time in many places ... unless we wish to take away Christ's true body. We must take care not to affirm that it is either diffused in many places, or present in them at the same time ... Not even the 'being' (essence) of angels, if I may so say, has this power, and theirs is rid of the mass of such a body as ours, to be able to be at the same time together in divers places.

P. 880. "But who of sound mind could say that Christ's flesh and blood was shut up either in the water in the desert, or in the

publice receptâ definitione, ea, quæ in eucharistiâ videntur, corporis et sanguinis Domini signa esse.

P. 878.

Primum quidem in sacramento eucharistiæ panem et vinum (quæ Divinæ literæ, patres, et sensus ipse ibi *vere* adesse testantur) corporis et sanguinis Domini signa esse affirmamus, &c. Adversarii nostri ex adverso corpus et sanguinem Christi proprie ac *vere* illa esse prædicant, &c.

P. 879, § 1.

(B.) *Verborum Christi tropus non exigit corporis et sanguinis Ejus realem substantialemque præsentiam.* Scripturæ Divinæ tradunt Christum, quoad humanam naturam, hinc *abiisse*, &c. Asserunt Christum dixisse, nos Eum non semper nobiscum habituros; verum oportere usque ad extremum diem Illum continere cælum, ut inde tandem ad judicandum veniat. § 2. Non convenit humano corpori, ut sit eodem tempore in multis locis... nisi velimus verum Christi adimere corpus. Cavendum ne illud in multis locis vel diffusum vel præsens simul esse affirmemus. § 3. Ne id quidem angelorum (ut ita dicam) essentia habet, quæ mole corporis privatur, ut eodem tempore simul et diversis in locis esse possit.

P. 880, § 5.

Quis autem sanæ mentis diceret carnem et sanguinem Domini vel in aquâ deserto vel in mannâ clausum fuisse? § 6. Manna enim illi et

manna? For they had the manna and the water, but we have the bread and the wine. ... But those that determine that the blood of the Lord is present in this sacrament must be asked, for what reason and on what colourable pretext they dare, as they do, to call their own sacrifice an unbloody sacrifice. Surely, if they will have the Lord's blood that flows from the Lord's side, as Chrysostom hyperbolically wrote, caught in His own cup, let them struggle as far as they will and know how, and can do it, they will never effect their escape from the charge that they drink a bloody cup. ... As if truly this presence of the Lord's body in the eucharist which they boast of and fight stoutly for, ... can effect a greater or a better, or any other useful benefit than we have by our spiritual perception, which is accomplished by faith in the mind.

*Words or opinions from which the whole of this discussion will easily slip out.* "To eat the flesh or body of the Lord and to drink His blood is to believe that these were given for us as the price of our redemption, and also are conjoined with those things [sins] which for us were taken away on the cross ... In the faithful receiving of the eucharist we are not only united through faith to Christ's body and blood in the will or mind, but we come out partakers of the grace of the Spirit and of the virtue (excellence, power) of our Lord, not indeed, by any force in the work itself, but by His own goodness and faithful promise ... Bread and wine, which (*in some way of their own*) both are and are called Christ's body and blood ... We are not less joined to Christ

aquam, nos vero panem et vinum habemus. § 8. Rogandi autem sunt isti, qui statuunt in hoc sacramento Domini sanguinem præsentem adesse, quâ ratione quo colore sacrificium, ut vocant, Suum ausint incurtum appellare. Profecto si Domini sanguinem, ut Chrysostomus hyperbolice scripsit, latere Domini fluentem in Suo calice volunt excipi, enitantur quantum volunt sciunt et possunt, quin cruentum potum hauriant numquam efficient... § 10. Quasi vero hæc ab istis jactata et propugnata præsentia corporis et sanguinis Domini in eucharistiâ...vel majorem, vel præstantiorem, vel ullam aliam potest efficere utilitatem, quam nos ex perceptione spirituali, quæ fide ac mente...peragitur, habemus.

(C.) *Dicta seu sententiæ ex quibus tota hæc disceptatio facilis evadet.* § 3. Edere carnem seu corpus Domini et bibere sanguinem est credere hæc pro nobis in pretium redemptionis fuisse data, et istis, quæ pro nobis in cruce sublata fuerunt, conjungi... § 5. In eucharistiæ fideli sumptione corpori et sanguini Christi non tantum animo seu mente per fidem copulamur, sed Spiritus gratiæ ac virtutis Domini nostri participes evadimus, non sane ex vi operis sed ex Ipsius bonitate et fideli promissione. § 6...panem et vinum, quæ (suo quodam modo) et sunt et dicuntur corpus et sanguis Christi... § 7. Non minus Christo in



in baptism than in the eucharist: wherefore the presence and perception of Him (*i.e.* in the spirit) is to be set at an equal amount in both... Faithful persons only truly and spiritually receive the Lord's body and blood, *i.e.* by faith. [Another sense of the word 'truly,' which when it stands alone as here, admits of the meaning genuine, higher, antitypical, &c., but not when coupled in Latin with such a word as *substantial*]... Our bodies are *in a certain peculiar way* nourished by Christ's body and blood... We ourselves by participating in faith, &c., &c., are nourished and are nearly transelemented. [Is not this driving too near to Roman teaching to be safe or sound? See Gregory of Nyssa.] The word of Divine learning [the Bible] in so far as it is received by us by faith is the body of Christ and the bread with which our souls are being nourished. That His body is spiritually present to communicants does not indeed mean that it is present invisibly, but yet (*i.e.* further) *properly* (lit. in its own characteristics) as the Papists say. [Upon this see the note at the end of the extracts from Peter Martyr.]... We admit in the eucharist no other sacrifice than those of giving thanks, of prayers, and our own offerings (alms, &c.) These truly ought not to be offered by the minister only, but also by the people communicating... We also offer a sacrifice there in so far as a commemoration of the true Sacrifice is there made...

P. 1068. *To the Senate of Strasburg, 1556.* "Our Saviour Jesus Christ consists of two natures conjoined in one and the same person, or hypostasis, and in these indeed not confused or tho-

---

baptismo jungimur quam in eucharistiâ; quare par utrobique Illius præsentia et perceptio (videlicet spiritualis) ponenda est. § 9. Soli fideles corpus et sanguinem Domini *vere* sumunt et spiritualiter—hoc est fide. § 10. Corpora nostra corpore et sanguine Christi suo quodam modo aluntur. § 11. Nos ipsi fidei participatione, &c. &c., alimur et propemodum *transelementamur*. § 13. Sermo Divinarum literarum... quatenus a nobis fide recipitur, corpus Christi est et panis quo animi nostri nutriuntur. § 17. Corpus spiritualiter adesse communicantibus non significat invisibiliter quidem sed tamen *proprie* adesse, *ut Papistæ dicunt*. § 19. In eucharistiâ nullum aliud sacrificium admittimus quam gratiarum actiones, precum et nostras ipsorum oblationes. Hæc vero non tantum a ministro sed etiam a plebe communicante debent offerri. § 20. Sacrificium etiam ibi esse damus, quatenus veri sacrificii commemoratio ibi fit, &c. &c. [Of these some are undesirable assertions as 6 and 10. This epitome, dated 1561, first printed 1568.]

P. 1068. *Confessio de Cœnâ Domini Senatui Argentinensi 1556*, in an addition to his *Loci Communes* from the editions of Basle and Zurich.

Servator noster Jesus Christus duabus naturis constat in unâ eâdemque personâ seu hypostasi conjunctis; nec his quidem confusis vel per-

roughly mingled, but with the properties and conditions of each safe and entire. And therefore it is conceded short of all controversy to Christ's Divinity, which is infinite, *i.e.* unbounded, and is circumscribed by no measures or termini, that it is everywhere. But such circumscribed bounds and limits are due to His manhood from His own nature and its truth, that it can neither be everywhere nor without some fixed location, not through any weakness of Divine power, but by the perpetual and unchangeable conditions of human nature. For as it cannot come to pass that the number three should be the number six, or that a thing that came to pass yesterday should [to-day] be undone, so it is not possible that what is a human body should not be a human body, the definition of which necessarily embraces distinct parts and members. Wherefore whoever confuse those points, and wish them to stand open as wide as the Divine Word; and that on that account that thing which is a human body is either everywhere or in many places, they (really) affirm that it is not a human body, and they say that that which has been created is not a creature. Since it is consistent with no creature, since it is a limited thing, to be at the same time in many places: but the church has never doubted that Christ, as to His human nature, is by the word of God [made] a creature [of God's hand]; Christ therefore, because He is a man, left the world [when He went to Heaven, and] is not held by us to be present in the body. For with Him ascended into Heaven that which it (the Heaven) must contain (or hold) or receive until the times of the restoring of all things, as Peter taught: Acts of the Apostles, chap. iii.... The signs of bread

---

mistis, sed proprietatibus et conditionibus utriusque salvis et integris. Ideoque Christi Divinitati, quæ infinita est et nullis mensuris aut terminis circumscribitur, *ut sit ubique*, citra controversiam conceditur. Humanitati vero, ex Ipsius naturâ et veritate ita circumscriptio termini et fines debentur, ut nec ubique neque absque certo aliquo loco esse possit, non sane imbecillitate Divinæ potentiae, sed naturæ humanæ perpetuâ immutabilique conditione. Sicut enim fieri non potest ut vel numerus ternarius fit senarius, vel ut res, heri gesta, sit infecta, sic non est possibile ut quod est humanum corpus non sit humanum corpus, cujus definitio necessario magnitudinem partes distinctas, et membra comprehendit. Quamobrem quicumque illud fundunt, et tam late patere volunt quam Divinum Verbum, et ob id vel ubique vel in multis locis esse id, quod humanum corpus est, non esse humanum corpus affirmant, et quod est creatum id dicunt non esse creaturam. Quid nulli creaturæ convenit, cum sit finita eodem tempore in multis locis esse; Christum vero, quod ad naturam humanam, ecclesia creaturam esse verbo Dei nunquam dubitavit: Christus igitur, quia homo est, mundum reliquit, a nobis corpore præsens non habetur. Cum Eo enim ascendit in cælum, quod eum continere seu accipere oportet usque ad tempora restitutionis omnium, ut Petrus in Actis Apostolicis cap. iii.

and wine having been interposed, which as far as the faithful are concerned, are efficacious instruments of the Holy Spirit while Christ's sacrament is being performed [this whole idea of the signs themselves being *efficacious*, will be treated of in the Third Part under the head Dean Goode], faith is excited in us, by which we unfeignedly apprehend with the mind both His body and blood, as they were delivered unto death and the cross for us unto the remission of sins. And this perception indeed, although it be of absent things, and takes place by the mind, does not so much yield profit to the mind alone, but overflows to the body also of them that receive it, so as by a certain sanctifying force and spiritual commerce it becomes able to receive a blessed resurrection unto eternal life ... [Bold presumptions surely, and unwarranted—at best mere possibilities.]

P. 1069. "Nor do I admit, nor can I acknowledge a real or substantial and corporal presence of Christ in the symbols or *in the communicants themselves*: though nevertheless I doubt not but affirm that yet a spiritual communion and participation of His body and blood is being given to communicants, [If *only* a spiritual one who would doubt it? What end do these ambiguities serve?], which may also be none the less had before the eating of the sacrament, &c. &c. Those words, 'This is my body,' were said by the Lord altogether tropically...By many it is not considered that the body of Christ can be truly communicated unless it shall be really and corporally present. [But what did he himself just now say?...] They in my judgment have not perceived the force of faith. For they do not observe that by it things that are present somewhere at a very great distance become by it (faith) present to

docuit...Symbolis interpositis panis et vini, quæ Spiritûs sancti (dum sacramentum Christi peragitur) quoad fideles, *efficacia* instrumenta sunt fides in nobis excitatur; quâ non ficto animo apprehendimus et corpus et sanguinem Ejus, ut pro nobis in mortem et crucem tradita sunt in remissionem peccatorum. Quæ sane perceptio, licet rerum absentium sit, et animo fiat, non tamen ipsi animo tantum prodest, verum ad corpus summentium redundat, ita ut *ei quâdam* sanctificationis, conjunctionisque spiritualis *capax fit* beatæ resurrectionis et æternæ vitæ.

P. 1069.

Neque in symbolis, neque in ipsis communicantibus realem aut substantialem corporalemque Christi præsentiam admitto, neque possum agnoscere; cum tamen communionem et participationem corporis et sanguinis Ejus communicantibus dari, spiritualement, non dubitem sed affirmem, quæ nihilominus et ante sacramenti manducationem habeatur, &c. &c. Verba illa, Hoc est corpus Meum, a Domino omnino tropice dicta sunt...A multis non existimatur corpus Christi *vere* posse communicari, nisi realiter et corporaliter...præsens fuerit...Ii meo iudicio vim fidei non satis perceptam habent. Non animadvertunt per eam præsentia nobis fieri quæ alioqui longissime distant.

us." [Present in what sense? It must be compatible with physical absence. The church of England says boldly, 'In Heaven and not here.']

*Note as to Extracts § 19 and from p. 1069.* Peter Martyr speaks (1) of the body of Christ being present invisibly indeed but still with its own necessary properties (*proprie*), as the Papists say, and (2) that "many" do not appear to have thought (non existimârunt) that Christ's *body* can be truly communicated except it be in reality (realiter) and corporally present (corporaliter præsens). This plainly anticipates the line of argument in Bellarmine, viz. that a human body can be severed from perceptibility through the organs of sight, touch, taste, &c., and yet remain a body: so that a body thus perceptible would be distinguished as of a grosser kind, but that a body of a finer kind destitute of such qualities would still be a human body and could be said to be present, as truly as a body in a real and corporeal condition. The thing that surprises me is not that certain Roman writers, after the light caught from the collision of the Council of Trent and the Reformations in England and Germany, should have recourse to this distinction as their last plank in their doctrinal shipwreck, but that such a man as Peter Martyr, lecturing at Oxford, should for a moment even seem to admit it. And this for two reasons: (1) A body so changed would no longer be a human body, perhaps not a body at all. In the most absolute and universal sense, a body that is incapable of being touched is not a body: angels are called wind, wind is air moving, and we touch air and we feel it too especially when in rapid motion, &c. &c.; but (2) There is no evidence within our experience in harmony with this Roman supposition. All miracles, that look at all like this, cannot be shewn to be of this order. A Lecture is printed at the end of this Part which touches on the notable Rome-maintained assertion that Christ's body "came through closed doors" on the evening after His resurrection. It might be generally asserted with more plausibility that many miracles are wrought on the human eye for the time, "Their eyes were holden, &c." "They smote the men with blindness that they wearied themselves to find the door." I mention this here at once, because Beza, who came a little later than Peter Martyr, deals both summarily and briefly with these last shifts of Rome. But see the extracts from Bishop Thirlwall, in the authors of the 19th century.

(U.) JOHN BRADFORD, FELLOW OF PEMBROKE HALL AND  
PREBENDARY OF ST PAUL'S. B. 1510. D. 1555.

He cannot be called a native of Manchester, as he was born at more than three miles distance, at Blackley. Like the late Mr Dallas, his preparation for Holy Orders was serving as bursar and victualling-officer in the British army. It was at the age of 37 that he entered himself for the study of law, but his biographer in the Parker Society has pointed out that it was a sermon of Latimer's, on restitution, that first brought him to himself and made him enter upon the service of Christ; and Mr Demaus has searched out the entries of the very sums that he restored to the Crown, as arrears in conscience due to it, amounting in all to above £300. And the interest of the story is increased by the fact, that Latimer after preaching wide and far his sermons on the plough—of which but one survives, and which were addressed to the English people generally—was invited to preach before the Court, and took this practical subject of restitution, and among those who were moved by it to saving repentance and faith was our own John Bradford. This story is akin to what Archdeacon Hare produces regarding Luther, that no one has so richly or so much dwelt upon and developed spiritual obedience to the ten commandments as the great German champion, in his treatise on the Galatians, of justification being by faith only. For Latimer in his sermon on the plough had been rooting up all rival atonements, propitiations and justifying of worship: and who but he stands up before the court, and enforces obedience to the claims of common justice! and Bradford's soul is the reward. Methinks if the Law were now more particularly urged in its details it might make men more generally feel that they need the Gospel.

*On the Mass in Sermons, &c. Parker Society.*

P. 394. "He biddeth us use this supper in the remembrance of His death and passion, *preaching it out* till He come. Whereby He doeth us to wit that corporally He is not there in the form of bread. Therefore saith St Paul, 'Till He come.'

P. 390. "The word of God knoweth no more oblations and sacrifices for sin, but one only; which Christ Himself offered,

never more to be offered ; but in remembrance thereof, His supper to be eaten sacramentally and spiritually, according to Christ's institution, which is so perverted now, that there is nothing in it simply according to the judge ; i.e. the word of God.

P. 392. "His human nature and body (which was made of the substance of the Virgin's body and not of bread) *in this body* I say He is and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty in heaven ; from whence (and not from the pyx) will He come to judge both quick and dead. In the mean season 'Heaven,' saith St Peter, 'must receive Him:' and, as St Paul saith, He prayeth for us and now is not seen elsewhere or otherwise seen than by faith.

P. 394. "Company not with them, but especially in their church service, but flee from them. For in what thing consent they to Christ's doctrine? He biddeth us pray in a tongue to edify. They command the contrary.

P. 395. "They take away all the sacrament by transubstantiation : for they take away the element, and so the sacrament.

P. 95. *On the Lord's Supper.* "Not that I mean any other presence of Christ's body than a presence by grace, a presence by faith, a presence spiritually, and *not corporally really naturally and carnally*, as the papists do mean ; for in such sort Christ's body is only in Heaven on the right hand of the Father Almighty. Whither *our faith* in the use of the sacrament ascendeth, and *receiveth the whole body* accordingly...But one will say that to call the sacrament on this sort is to give an occasion of idolatry to the people, which will take the sacrament they see simply for Christ's body, as by experience we are too well taught, &c. &c. [He then argues that we *must* call it Christ's body, because it is so called in the Bible, adding] If the ministers did their duty in catechising and preaching, then doubtless to call it Christ's body and to esteem it *accordingly* could not give occasion to idolatry and confirm it. Therefore woe be to them that preach not.

P. 96. "Lest we should make too light of it, *making it a bare sign* and no better than common bread, the Holy Ghost calleth it Christ's body...Objection. Why, saith one, to call the sacrament Christ's body, and to make none other presence of Christ's body than by grace spiritually and to faith, is to make no presence at all, or to make Him *no otherwise present than He is in His word*, where it is preached, and then what need to receive the sacrament? &c. (From) Answer. The presence which we believe and confess is such a presence as the world knoweth not and the world cannot learn, &c. Therefore to grant a presence to faith is not to make no presence at all, but to such as know not faith.

[Among many authorities] Cyril saith, We eat the virtue of Christ's proper flesh. Epiph., The body or grace. Jerome, spiritual flesh. All which sayings do confirm this our faith."

(V.) ROGER HUTCHINSON. D. 1555.

There are three very interesting things in his history. One that he and Thomas Lever were associated in a discussion in St John's at Cambridge, "Whether the mass is the same thing as "the Lord's supper or not." A second is that he and Lever with two others were united with our three great Reformers in visiting and trying to save poor Joan Bocher, the Maid of Kent. A third is, that Hutchinson lying ill and near to death in 1555, sent a consoling message by the hands of Day to Rogers the first martyr in Mary's reign. Hutchinson had risen to be a senior fellow in his college.

*The Image of God.* Parker Society.

P. 37. "All the fathers before Gregory confess, and the Scriptures do witness, that there must be three similitudes in the sacrament; a similitude of nourishing, a similitude of unity, and a similitude of conversion...The similitude of conversion is this, that as the bread and wine are turned into the nature of our bodies, so, by the receiving of Christ's body and blood, *we are turned into the nature of them &c.* John vi., We be made one flesh and one blood; and Christ saith, The same nature that My flesh and blood hath, the same getteth he that eateth Me.

P. 230. *Sermon on the Lord's Supper.* "He gave it them into their hands to eat, and not to honour it; to receive it and not to worship it with lifting up of their hands and knocks upon their breasts. Only God is to be honoured with this kind of reverence, and no sacrament; for God is not a sacrament, neither is the sacrament God...Christ gave it them into their hands, not into their mouths. Neither be thou afraid to take it and handle it with thy hands as they did. The council holden at Rotomage (Rouen) did first forbid them to take it into their hands. Regard more Christ's example and the example of His disciples and of the primitive church, which always did take it into their hands."

*Note.* See on this subject the detailed injunctions as to the mode of receiving the bread and the wine in the extracts from Cyril of Jerusalem. If the mind and heart are right, it will produce a recoil.

(W.) JOHN HAUSSCHEIN (ÆCOLAMPADIUS). B. 1482. D. 1531.

If Melanchthon was a true second self to Luther, dealing with those aspects of affairs with which he was unfit to grapple, this divine was the nearest friend and helper to Zwingel. In the international law, of which alone the Swiss Reformer was ignorant, there was none to anticipate the science of future ages, and act for him, as Melanchthon acted for Luther at Augsburg, and often afterwards: but Hausschein followed the lead of Zwingel with singular accord, and only survived him a few weeks. He was born in Franconia; and becoming an early student he retired to monkish life near Augsburg; but it was to Basle that he was drawn when he entered upon the active ministry. There another point was soon fixed, *viz.* his preference for Zwingel's views on the Lord's supper. His bias, however, was towards the mystic theology from the first. Scholasticism was not his choice. Capito, the companion of his studies at Heidelberg, induced the bishop to allure him from Augsburg. Erasmus is as usual very witty on Hausschein's marrying a very beautiful young woman: but his own painful history in that respect made him also a strong satirist of priestly celibacy. Hausschein worked his way onward and upward to the principles of the Reformation with sagacity and steadiness. He like Zwingel was well acquainted with the three chief theological languages. He was useful to Zwingel as a controversialist, and received a rebuff from Luther at Marburg. Unfit for a leader he was an admirable seconder, and an invaluable minister. He will never be forgotten in his chosen city.

P. 183. "Receive what I without reserve believe. The bread and wine are not to me the only things to confirm the sacramental promise by which my sins are remitted, that it may be the more believed by my weak conscience. For while I am looking for greater things it matters not to me what sort of bread and wine is

---

*From the Letter of John Hausschein, printed in Bucer, p. 183.*

Aperte quid credam habe. Sacramentalia signa, quibus sacramentalis promissio confirmatur, quâ remittuntur peccata mea, ut credibilior sit infirmæ conscientiæ meæ, non mihi sunt panis et vinum. Nihil enim ad me qui majora quæro qualis panis vel vinum adhibeatur, sed



used, but I require certain things of a more wonderful kind, which have an efficacy in adding stability to my weak mind. But these are nothing less than His body itself, and the blood (not Spiritus) itself; not a figure either of body or blood, but the body which was delivered up and suffered for my sin. And that which angels delicately enjoy in heaven, and which Christ promised that He would give; and gave not for carnal but for spiritual food. So also of the blood which flowed forth from His side for my sins. For that efficaciously signs the promise of my deliverance from the faults of (all) my sins ... Wherefore doubtless this testifies that this is Christ's seal that to me, eating and drinking after a spiritual manner, all my sins have been forgiven; since with this object He suffered for me. Christ's word went before, and the result has sealed it with His most sacred seal. I hunger and thirst after this bread and drink, not that it may undergo assimilation into me like bodily food, but that I may be assimilated into Him, and by spiritual food may become spiritual, so that when I shall have been in Christ, He also abiding in me, as having been received in the sacrament, may work of Himself by His own grace; by which I was thus prepared to attend to the wants of all the members of Christ, even if I had to die for them, as He Himself died for me, and that I may thus become a true member in His own mystical body, not in the body of Antichrist, because I refuse to have a portion with him, but I desire to be a member of Christ, even the lowest. I cannot now open my mind more. Take this in good part. Be a man, and hope in the Lord. Basle, April 19.

---

*requiro mirabiliora quædam, ad imbecillam mentem meam solidandam efficacia. Illa autem non sunt nisi ipsummet corpus et ille ipse sanguis, non figura vel corporis vel sanguinis, sed corpus quod traditum est et passum pro peccato meo. Atque id, quo angeli in cælo delicate fruuntur, quod Christus promisit Se daturum, et dedit in cibum non carnalem sed spiritualem. Similiter et sanguis qui e latere profluxit pro peccatis meis. Is enim efficaciter obsignat promissionem emendationis meæ ab omni iniquitate meâ... Quo nimirum hoc testatur hoc Christi sigillum esse, quod credenti et spiritualiter manducanti condonata sunt peccata mea, quandoquidem hac de causâ pro me passus est. Verbum Christi præcessit, quod obsignavit effectus sacrosancto signaculo. Hunc panem et potum esurio et sitio, non ut in me convertatur sicut corporalis cibus, sed ego in Illum vertar et spirituali cibo spiritualis fiam, ut quam fuero ego in Christo, Christus quoque in me manens, utpote in sacramento sumptus, per gratiam Suam operetur suâ operâ; quâ ita paratus sum ad obsequendum omnibus membris Christi, etiam si pro illis moriendum, sicut Ipse pro me mortuus est, et ita fiam verum membrum in Suo illo mystico corpore, non in corpore anti-Christi, quia portionem cum illo habere nolo, sed membrum cupio esse Christi vel infimum. Non possum nunc apertius. Tu hæc boni consulito. Viriliter age, et spera in Domino. Basileæ, 19 Aprilis.*

[A manifest difference between him and Bucer! The page is not loaded with assertions of the real presence, and then lightened again by assertions of spiritual benefit to be derived from it. And yet the terms *ipsummet corpus et ille ipse sanguis*, used in such distinct connexion with the supper, indicate a *seasoning* of the mind with the same doctrine from which none so near to Germany could wholly escape, and to which Calvin in his way gave a partial sanction. It is a very rich specimen of spiritual emotion and joy; but clearness fades before feeling.]

*De Verbis Cæncæ Domini Liber.*

This copy bears the honoured name Christopher Benson, and the following note in his handwriting. "Erasmus seems to have regarded this work of Ecolampadius—on the natural exposition of our Lord's words 'This is My body, &c.' as the most formidable attack on Transubstantiation and most able defence of sacramentarian views which had been published by any of the Reformers. Fleury, Eccl. 129—3. It was published 1524."

*Note.* Sacramentarian is here used in its historical Reformation sense derived from "a sign or sacrament."

P. II. "To the common 'Master' of errors our attention shall be turned [*i.e.* to Peter Lombard, called 'The Master of the Sentences.'] For it is he, who has thrown us headlong together into a whirlpool of error. We are drinking from his fountains not living water, but, to say nothing sharper, turbid water. But I have no mind to disparage Thomas Aquinas, nor Duns Scotus, nor any of the later writers; but I blame that Peter, patcher together of sentences, whom they call Master; who himself also might rub his own error against that of another rhapsodist, as for instance John

The whole title is *De Genuina verborum Domini Hoc est corpus Meum &c., juxta vetustissimos auctores, expositione liber.*

P. A. II. Ad errorum communem Magistrum [*i.e.* Magistrum Sententiarum] me convertam. [How can his book, which is the essence of the fathers, cause him rightly to be thus described if the true sense of Christ's words can be shewn to have been accepted and taught by the 'vetustissimi auctores' of the full title? But this inconsistency still lives.] Is enim est qui nos simul in barathrum erroris præcipitavit. Bibimus ex ejus fontibus non aquam vivam, sed, ne quid dicam asperius, turbulentam. Non autem Thomam Aquinatem, neque Scotum [Duns Scotum], neque ex recentioribus quenpiam traducere est animus, sed Petrum illum sententiarum consarcinatorem, quem magistrum appellant, incuso; qui et ipse errorem suum rhapsodo alii, uti Damasceno vel

Damascenus or Gratian. [How far is it just to treat Peter Lombard as the offender, as a mere misrepresenter of the fathers, and to couple John of Damascus and Gratian? I must again say that this book, with genuine extracts from the various authorities, enables every one to judge; and perhaps it may cause many learned readers to re-weigh the full utterances of the fathers, and see whether Lombard is here righteously made a scapegoat for all]. Nor do I this, assailing him as if I were ungrateful for other benefits. But I ought not to dissemble my having been seduced as well as others, to save from hatred a man that by God's judgment must be left to stand or fall. But I wish to have that error dispersed, even such as either he augmented, or others not much varying from him, did not altogether cleanse after it had been in part augmented. [This is much lower ground to take, as if Lombard had but augmented error that he found in the fathers. This might be.] Wherefore I do not enter a combat of shadows, though he has now departed from the living some years ago. For his book still lives, thickly surrounded with some myriads of satellites.

P. v. "Doubtless the townsmen of Capernaum may be compared to Achis, king of Gath. Achis pronounces David mad, while he is cunningly humbling himself and changing his countenance, and letting the froth of his saliva run down his beard. The men of Capernaum reckon Christ possessed and silly, when He promises them His own flesh to eat. Achis not knowing David's cleverness lets him go. The Capernaïtes not understanding the celestial Wisdom withdraw from Him. David being dismissed is recognized by his brethren and all his father's house. When the people of Capernaum retire, the apostles make an honest confession by the

Gratiano, affricare posset. Neque hoc ago, de aliis beneficiis velut ingratus, eum arguens; sed meam aliorumque seductionem dissimulare non debeo, quin nec hominem qui in iudicio Dei aut stetit aut cecidit, exosum [a verb wanted]. Sed errorem profigitatum velim, qualem aut ille auxit, aut alii, non multum ab eo variantes auctum aliquâ ex parte sed non in integrum purgarunt. Quapropter non cum larvis pugnam in eo, quamvis ante aliquot annos e vivis ille excesserit. Vivit enim liber ejus adhuc, myriadibus aliquot satellitum stipatus.

P. A. v. Conferendi nimirum sunt Capernaum municipales Achi Getheorum regi, 1 Kings xxi. Achis furibundum pronunciat Davidem vafre se humiliantem et mutantem os ac salivam in barbam despumantem. Capernaïtæ arrepticiū ac desipientem censent Christum promittentem carnem suam ad manducandum. Achis non cognoscens prudentiam Davidis illum dimittit. Capernaïtæ non intellegentes cœlestem sapientiam ab illo retrocedunt. David dismissus a fratribus et omni domo patris agnoscitur. Retrocedentibus Capernaïtis, honeste confiten-

mouth of Peter ... not only those do not attain to perfect knowledge who hate Christ's word, but also those who promise themselves a carnal repast, as if Christ's flesh was contained in the bread. But it is those that dwell with Peter and Christ who more clearly know the sacraments that were secret and hidden from the [past] ages, and these are very far from meriting the reproach of madness.

B. "It is certain that the church in the apostles' time paid no admiration to this miracle, if the church held it to be such. Before other miracles of much less pretension the apostles were stupefied with astonishment. Towards this the apostles were no more held fast by wonder than at eating the passover lamb just before. Further, they did not put a single word of questioning, who at other times asked questions to the point of weariness and impotency, even in many cases unseasonably; and now they ask about the Father, now about the traitor, and now about the way, and the little while in which He is to be seen, of the primacy, and of His not being about to manifest Himself to the world. But how comes it to pass that the new wonder of the resurrection He marks by so many evident signs during forty days, and this [new wonder of the change of the bread and wine] not by even one sign through all Scripture, when indeed to establish such a thing many signs and prodigies were needed?"

P. B. III. "From this we also shall rightly say that the apostles gave no wonder to that thing which, in your explanation, was the greatest of all, and the miracle of miracles: for also they are

tur apostoli per Petrum...ad perfectam Christi notitiam non perveniunt, non solum qui a sermone Christi abhorrent, sed etiam qui carnalem sibi mensam pollicentur, quasi in pane contenta sit caro Christi. Petri autem et domestici Christi sunt qui arcana sacramenta et a seculis abscondita clarius cognoscunt procul ab insanis probo alieni.

B. Certum est ecclesiam tempore apostolorum...miraculum hoc, si pro miraculo habuit non admiratam fuisse. Ad miracula alia multo minora obstupescebant apostoli. Supra hoc autem non plus admirationis tenuit Apostolos quam, supra, agni paschalis esu; proinde et ne verbum quidem interrogabant, alio qui ad fastidium et importunitatem usque, etiam pleraque intempestive sciscitantes, nunc de Patre, nunc de proditore, nunc de viâ, et pusillo temporis quo nunc videndus, de primatu, deque eo quod non esset mundo Se manifestaturus. Qui fit autem quod resurrectio tot signis evidentibus per dies quadraginta innovat, hoc ne uno quidem per omnem scripturam, quum sane ad ipsum statuendum multis erat opus signis et prodigiis?

P. B. III. Unde et nos recte dicemus, rem illam omnium maximam et miraculum miraculorum, secundum vos, apostolos non fuisse admira-

not recorded as having stood up during the supper when it took place, &c. As we read that they remained simply as they were in (hearing) the word of God and prayer, so was it in this rite of breaking bread. I would fain be taught in what part of the rite there was introduced your immoderate apparatus of ceremonies: where the adoration was: where the admiration. In every part are the indications of a pure and simple religion; and affection is commended by their piety.

B. III. "Moreover, if also we truly and with the whole heart readily believed Christ in this manner, it were strange if we can be torn away from expressing our admiration, and if we are not for days and nights prostrate before that bread, and, instead of at matins and vespers only, do nothing else but this.

B. VII. "Detested be the love of contention in things of so great import. They do even wholly withdraw from church custom, who reject figures where they are most necessary, or instead of figures unseasonably insist upon exact expressions. What is there in a man's calling out 600 times 'A trope, a trope, a trope,' and another cries out again 'Take care, take care of the trope,' and their ears are by turns stopped, that the meaning of scripture in its own sense may not be heard, and in what way that which is said is said. Because doubtless by fair reason all the greatest absurdities may be overcome. But we here affectionately kiss the words of God; but we will strive, if God allow, certainly to shew that a trope of expression lies under them, since by bread and a

tos. Recumbabant enim et nec exsurrexisse in cœna perhibentur...Sicut in verbo Dei ac precibus simpliciter permansisse leguntur, ita et in hoc frangendi panem ritu. Doceri velim ubi cæemoniarum ille immodicus apparatus? ubi adoratio? ubi admiratio? Ubique indicatur pura simplexque religio et commendatur cum pietate charitas.

B. III. Porro et nos si vere et toto corde crederemus hoc modo Christum presto, mirum si ab adoratione avelli possumus, et non dies ac noctes ante panem illum prosternimur et pro matutinis et vespertinis horis hoc solum agamus.

P. B. VII. Detestanda profecto rixandi libido in tantis rebus. Prorsus etiam a consuetudine ecclesiasticâ recedunt qui tropos, quo loco maxime oportebat, rejiciunt, vel pro tropis intempestive rigida verba exposcunt. Quid est si sexcenties clamemus, "Tropus, tropus, tropus"; alius autem reclamet "Cave, cave tropum;" et vicissim obturentur aures, ne audiat quid sibi velit scriptura et quomodo dicatur quod dicitur. Quia nimirum et ratione absurdissima quæque evinci possent. Cæterum nos hic verba Domini exosculamur; sed subesse tropum idiomatis certe commonstrare, concedente Domino, nitemur, quandoquidem per panem

sacred symbol he commended the figure of His body, and by the breaking of it and its delivery to death we may be nourished and quickened.

P. B. VIII. "We are said to be buried together with Christ by baptism. He does not say by baptism we are signified to have been buried together with Him. But He says outright, We have been buried with Him. It has been shewn that there is no miracle in the mystic bread above man's conception: and since that word, 'This is My body,' cannot stand without a figure, that we may escape many obstacles: namely, not preserving the genuine sense of Scripture, and contending against the essential spirit and glory of God, we assert that the name sacrament was rightly given, as the name of the thing which it signifies. [I should urge that a sacrament is the *signum ipsum*, not the *res sacramenti*.] Therefore not moved by light causes, and not destitute of sayings of the fathers, we depart from the opinion of the multitude, but we profess and embrace what we ought and what are just, (as) the Writing of the holy Spirit teaches, and what are healthful to our souls and belong to our Christ's glory, the true bread of men and angels, who will feed us ever, now with His own faith, and hereafter with glory. Amen.

P. E. VI. "It is besides puerile and foolish to think that flesh enters our soul. For how is a soul able to receive flesh, since it is not corporeal, nor supplies room for body?... Hear Augustine on Genesis... Besides, if all that is of flesh is flesh, if the flesh of Christ after the manner of carnal eating feed the soul, it then makes the soul carnal; and does not now perfect it but makes it

---

*et sacrosanctum symbolum figuram corporis commendavit; cujus fractione et in mortem traditione alimur et vivificemur.*

P. B. VIII. *Dicimur consequuti Christo per baptismum. Non dicit per baptismum significamur consequuti. Sed prorsus ait, consequuti sumus. Demonstratum est nullum miraculum in pane mystico esse, supra hominis captum; et quum sermo ille, "Hoc est corpus," absque tropo constare non possit, ut multa effugiamus quæ obstant, nempe ne germanum scripturæ sensum minus servemus et ne contra ipsissimum spiritum ac gloriam Dei pugnemus, recte et sacramentum nomine rei, quam significat, traditum asserimus. Unde non tenuibus moti causis, nec patrum destituti sententiis, a vulgi sententiâ discedimus; sed ea profitemur ac amplexamur, quæ debemus ac justa sunt, scriptura Spiritus sancti docet, quæque animabus salutaria et ad gloriam pertinent Christi nostri veri animorum angelorumque panis. Qui nos suâ nunc fide et olim gloriâ pascet semper. Amen.*

P. E. VI. *Puerile alioquin et ineptum est opinari quod animam nostram ingrediatur caro. Quomodo enim anima capax est carnis quæ non est corporea nec locum præbet corpori?... Augustinus super Genesim, lib. 7, c. 12. Præterea si omne quod ex carne caro est, si caro Christi manducationis carnalis modo animam pascit, animam ergo carneam facit,*

weaker. But it is expedient for the soul to come out spiritual and Divine; and this it attains to for the most part by its union with the grace of the word. For Christ's words are life-giving, and make us spiritual, if indeed they have fallen into good ground."

et jam non perficit sed infirmiore reddat. Animæ autem expedit ut spiritualis evadat et Divina; quod assequitur unione gratiæ verbi potissimum. Verba enim Christi vivifica sunt, spiritualesque reddentia, siquidem in bonam terram ceciderint.

(X.) MARTIN BUCER. B. 1491. D. 1551.

He and John Hausschein (by a fashion which now appears childish changed into Œcolampadius, the most outrageous, because the longest of the Grecised names), once taught at Strasburg: but Hausschein moved down to Basle. Hallam's account of Bucer who was originally a Dominican is imperfect, as he has not allowed in his estimate of Bucer for his retractation in Luther's favour; which is printed in his Commentary on Matthew xxvi., nor for a letter from John Hausschein, which Bucer there inserts. Any one may indeed reply that in his kindness of heart and love of unity Bucer seems in it to overshoot the truth on the other side. But there was abundant room for variations in Germany in this changing controversy: and yet who can refuse to agree with Hallam when he says in his Constitutional History, i. 91, note, "The truth is "there were but two opinions at bottom on this main point of the "controversy: nor in the nature of things was it possible there "should be more. For what can be predicated concerning a *body* "—in its relation to a given space—but presence and absence"? Yet we must add that John of Paris' impanation—which appears in Hallam's own extract from Luther in the words "in pane esse"—is not the same as the Transubstantiation of the 13th and 16th centuries: Bucer's view too, and John Calvin's—to allude to no more now—are both different from these and from each other. So hard is it, when party or blind patriotism or (must it be said?) when in part self-love and self-seeking make men desire to differ, not to find a defensible way. And sometimes in the very weariness of controversy and in a longing for unity, something of truth is surrendered. This seems to me to have taken place in the agreements entered

into between Calvin and the Swiss churches after the untimely and lamentable death of Zwingel; and also in several cases in which Melanchthon afterwards took the lead. But truth will in the end float to the top even in this controversy: and the greatest honour a true mind can aspire to is to help truth to its rightful sovereignty.

Hallam rightly, as it seems to me puts "real" and "corporal" as equivalents.

Martin Bucer, born at Schelestadt in Alsace, as well as Peter Martyr born in Italy, became half Englishmen by coming over and accepting Professorships, the latter at Oxford the former at Cambridge, where Bucer also died. But Strasburg (Argentoratum) must be reckoned Bucer's seat, and Basle that of Hausschein, though the latter was first a preacher at Strasburg cathedral. It is Bucer of Strasburg and Ecolampadius of Basle, with whom history is most concerned.

After leaving the study of law Hausschein, unsatisfied with his equipment for the ministry, went to Stuttgart to profit by the teaching of the famous Reuchlin, and on his return to Heidelberg added Hebrew to the two classical tongues, in which theology is so deeply involved; and it was Wolfgang Capito that procured him his invitation to Basle, the city of his principal labours. As the dates shew, he died early, *viz.* in his 49th year. His struggle with John Cochläus at Basle in 1524 and his publication of Anti-Cochläus seem to be his most noted labours. His efforts at reconciling the German with the Helvetic divines partook too much of the nature of a compromise to be successful then, or to attract admiration since. We can give him little more than the colourless credit of good intentions. He was born at Weinsburg in the same year as George Spalatin.

Bucer went from Schelestadt to Heidelberg to study, and there received his first gospel light from a work of Erasmus, and afterwards a fuller understanding from one of Luther's; whom he afterwards joined at Worms, and had free conference with him there. Going with the elector-palatine to Belgium, he boldly rebuked the superstitions there prevalent, so that he was in peril of his life, like Paul at Jerusalem: but his friend and patron Francis Sickenger protected him. In 1513 he came to join Caspar Hedeo at Strasburg and they, together with Lilling, reformed the religious customs of the city. In 1541 he took part in the Emperor's



council of divines at Ratisbon, joining Melanchthon and others against Eck and his Papal supporters. Herman, Archbishop of Cologne, so favoured Bucer's side, that the Pope displaced him; so that little good arose from that council, and Bucer saw his way clear at Edward VI.'s desire to come to the professorship at Cambridge, where Paulus and Fagius both died, as men unused to that climate. When at length he followed them, he was buried in Great St Mary's, honoured by a throng of mourning students, to whom he was yet speaking. In Mary's reign his bones and his books were both condemned to be burned.

*Letter to Lathomus.*

P. 39. "Since it is clearer than the light of noon, what the Lord instituted in the sacred supper and commanded to be done by us, and since it is not lawful to any fathers or councils at all, for any cause to establish aught concerning sacraments or any other things contrary to what the Lord Himself and the apostles have openly determined—a thing which both councils and pontiffs (a word sometimes used for the pope, sometimes for a bishop) themselves confess, it follows, &c.

P. 305. *The antithesis between the Lord's Supper and the Mass.* "Christ the Lord, to excite in His disciples true penitence for sins and just hunger and thirst for the eucharist, before He supplied them with His own flesh and blood to eat and drink, taught them in a most weighty and clear address concerning true righteousness and solid faith in the Scriptures. Therefore also He wishes the guests for His table to be sanctified by His ministers to receive His supper for their health by the preaching both of the law and of His own gospel, all human comments having

*P. 39. Epistola ad Lathomum. Strasburg, 1544.*

Cum luce meridianâ clarius patet quid in sacrâ cœnâ Dominus instituerit et nobis faciendum præceperit; et cum nullis omnino vel patribus vel conciliis ullâ de causâ liceat circa sacramenta aut ullas alias res quicquam statuere contra id quod Dominus Ipse et apostoli aperte definierunt, quod et concilia et pontifices ipsi fatentur sequitur &c.

*P. 305.*

*Antithesis cœnæ Domini et Missæ.* Christus Dominus ut veram peccatorum pœnitentiam atque justam esuriem et sitim eucharistiæ in discipulis excitaret, priusquam eis Suum carnem et sanguinem præberet edendum et bibendum, gravissimâ et clarissimâ concione eos de verâ justitiâ et solidâ fide in Scripturis docuit. Ideo et per ministros Suos vult convivas mensæ Suæ prædicatione et legis et evangelii Sui, omnibus humanis commentis rejectis, ad cœnam Suam salutariter sumendam

been cast aside... Our Priest and Saviour Jesus Christ gave thanks at the ministration of bread and wine in sincere religion, and unquestionably concerning all the benefits of God the Father, conferred upon or promised to the human race. And to Him to whom (He uttered) thanks and blessing without doubt the most religious prayers were not omitted... that He might vehemently excite His disciples to give thanks with Him and pray... The Lord Jesus our High Priest pronounced in a clear and intelligible voice those words of His own to sanctify His own sacraments to us—a custom which the ancient church always observed and the Greek church observes at this day..

*Commentaries on the four Gospels, revised the second and last time.* Robert Stephens, 1553. Matthew xxvi. p. 184.

“God so formed us by nature that in all our graver actions we add signs to words...and therefore He gave these here. Now there was not bread only but also the cup of the Lord. This therefore was the gift itself. Bread was but a sign by which the Lord was delivering this invisible and imperceptible gift in a visible and perceptible way... He said not, ‘Receive and eat: I am this, the ‘bread of life, Who came down from Heaven,’ but He delivered to them separately His own body by the sign of holy bread, His own blood by the sign of wine: not that these (two) were either then separated or are now: but He wished by it to express that He is the sacred victim of our salvation, and that by His own death (by the oblation of His own body and

ante magno studio sanctificari...Sacerdos noster et Servator Jesus Christus ad panem et calicem grates egit religione sincerâ et indubie de omnibus beneficiis Dei Patris humano generi collatis et promissis: Cui gratiarum actionem et benedictionem; item preces indubie religiosissimæ haud defuerunt...ut discipulos ad unâ agendum gratias et precandum vehementer excitaret...Dominus Jesus, summus Sacerdos noster verba illa Sua, quibus sacramenta Sua nobis sanctificaret...clarâ et intelligibili voce prædicavit, quem morem ecclesia vetus semper observavit et observat hodie ecclesia Græca.

*In Sacra Quatuor Evangelia Enarrationes...secundum et postremum recognitæ, &c. &c.* R. Stephanus, 1553. Matt. xxvi. p. 184.

Naturâ nos sic finxit Deus, ut in omnibus gravioribus actionibus symbola verbis adjiciamus...quod itaque hic dedit. Jam non tantum panis erat sed etiam calix Domini. Hoc ergo donum ipsum erat. Panis symbolum modo erat, quo Dominus donum hoc invisibile et insensibile visibiliter atque sensibilibus tradebat.. Non dixit “Accipite manducate. “Hoc sum Ego, panis vitæ Qui de cœlo descendi,” sed seorsim tribuit sancti corpus Suum symbolo panis, sanguinem Suum vini: non quod hæc se juncta vel tum essent vel nunc sunt; sed voluit eo exprimere sacram hostiam esse salutis nostræ, et morte Suâ nos (oblatione corporis

blood) He restores us. He willed that solemn mention be made in this sacrifice not of this only, that He is truly our Heavenly bread, i.e. our only sustenance to eternal life, but, &c.... In this... new way, the bread and cup, but together; and He eminently shews and exhibits the flesh and blood of the Lord and the new covenant. [P. 185.] Nothing can of certainty be affirmed concerning Him, whether the Lord Christ is circumscribed to His own place in Heaven. However, as the sun, truly visible in one place in the sky, is yet by its presence in its rays put forth in true substantiality in any part of the world, so the Lord, although He be circumscribed in one place of the secret Heaven of God, i.e. of the glory of the Father, yet by His own word and sacred signs He is Himself exhibited in the holy supper, truly and entire, God and man, present in the sacred supper, and that substantially.... That is a secret and a thing of new testament faith. We must simply cling to the word of the Lord, and faith ought to supply a supplement to the deficiency of the senses. They who give their hearts to this will easily come to agreement on this sacred thing. The abominable doctrine, by which this sacrament has been all but put down by untrue bishops and false teachers, is contained in this one point, that they have tied all the wonder of the populace and all their confidence in this sacrament to the sacramental presence, almost without making any mention of its true use. For that reason he is now busy in seeing nothing but symbols, in adding outward ornamentation, in setting them together in a way to pay honour to them, in putting them forth as a spectacle, and in carrying them about in magnificent pomp, for the keeping off of

---

et sanguinis Sui) restituere. Voluit solennem haberi in hoc sacrificio mentionem non hujus tantum quod Ipse vere panis cœlestis noster, hoc est una sustentatio nostra in vitam æternam sed &c....Hoc...novo modo panem et poculum, sed simul, et præcipue demonstrat, et exhibet carnem et sanguinem Domini et testamentum novum. P. 185. Nihil de Eo firmum affirmari potest, an Dominus Christus Suo circumscriptus est loco aliquo cœli. Attamen ut sol, vere in uno loco cœli visibilis...*radis* tamen suis *præsens vere* substantialiter exhibetur ubilibet orbis; ita Dominus, etiamsi circumscribitur uno loco cœli arcani et Divini, i.e. gloriæ Patris, verbo tamen Suo et sacris symbolis vere et totus Ipse, Deus et homo, præsens exhibetur in sacra cœnâ eoque substantialiter... Res ista arcana est et novi testamenti res fidei...Verbo Domini simpliciter inhaerendum est, et debet fides sensuum defectui præbere supplementum. Hoc qui student, iis facile de hoc sacro conveniet. Abominatio, quâ hoc sacramentum a pseudepiscopis et falsis doctoribus tantum non oppressum est, in ea totâ continetur quod cunctam vulgi admirationem et fiduciam erga hoc sacramentum in præsentia fixerunt sacramentali, nullâ prope veri usus ejus factâ mentione. Inde videre modo symbola studet, externe ornare, honorifice collocare, spectaculo proponere, atque magnificâ pompâ circumferre, ad quævis mala arcenda et bona concili-

any calamities whatever for winning any kind of good, without any thought either of penitence or holy communion by which the Lord offers and exhibits Himself to us in that sacrament. Let us with united earnestness drive away that abomination by the word of God, and none the less diligently commend to all the true presence and exhibition of our Lord in this rite, to be embraced by them with lively faith.

P. 260. "With vain fear I should yet shrink from certain forms of expression, and some by which I should dread lest a more gross presence of the Lord in the supper than is fitting should be instilled, and more should be assigned to the minister than would be proper. Now I have fully recognized the true presence and exhibition of the flesh and blood of the Lord. I have been anxious to do both in my retraction inserted under Matt. xxvi. Let him read that retraction who may desire anything further from me.

P. 182. *Retraction on the Supper of the Lord.* "I have been constrained ... to guard myself, lest either His impanation, or His being locally included in the bread or some preposterous trust in the mere external act of the sacrament should be brought against me ... that from that Luther and others might judge that I acknowledge nothing beyond bread and wine in the sacred supper, and attribute no more to sacraments than to be the tokens of the Christian society. But I affirm this before the Lord of His church, referring to the testimony of the books published by me,

anda, sine omni cogitatione vel pœnitentiæ vel sacræ communionis, quâ Se Dominus isto sacramento offert nobis et exhibet. Istam abominationem communi studio per verbum Dei profligemus, et veram nihilominus præsentiam et exhibitionem hic Domini nostri omnibus diligenter commendemus, vivâ fide amplectendas. [Some points in this are very Lutheran.]

*P. 260, on John VI.*

Frustraneo metu adhuc horrerem quasdam loquendi formas, et quibus vereretur statui æquo crassiorem Domini in cœna præsentiam et ministro tribui plus quam par esset... Jam ego præsentiam veram et exhibitionem carnis et sanguinis Domini diserte agnovi. Utrumque facere studui in Retractione 26 cap. Mat. insertâ. Eam legat qui amplius aliquid desiderarit.

*P. 182. Retractatio de Cœna Domini.*

Pertractus sum...cavere ne vulgo impanatio Christi, vel localis Ejus in pane inclusio, aut præpostera aliqua externa in sacramenti actiones fiducia ingereretur...ut inde Lutherus et alii judicarent me nihil quam panem et vinum in sacrâ cœna agnoscere, et sacramentis nihil amplius tribuere quam esse tesseras societatis Christianæ. Ego autem hoc coram Domino ecclesiæ Ejus affirmo, testibus libris a me editis, me nunquam

that I never was of the opinion that nothing is exhibited and distributed in the sacred supper but bread and wine, empty signs of the body and blood of the Lord... and not also the body itself and blood of the Lord... Yet I have never denied that they are at the same time used by the Lord to commend to us His own mercy and to exhibit the gifts of life. Yea this is the gift itself, and that not in one place [but in all]. That one dogma have I assailed, that sacraments of themselves [lit. out of themselves, *i.e.* by inherent power] confirm faith, for this doubtless is the work of the Holy Spirit. But in the progress of this dispute, when Luther was setting forth the whole matter of the sacraments more explicitly, I saw that he neither united the body and blood of the Lord with the bread and wine by any link of connexion, nor included it locally in the bread and wine; nor attributed a virtue of their own to sacraments, for they be of themselves to bring salvation to them that receive them: but only laid down that there is a sacramental union between the body of the Lord and the bread [what union is this beyond the one representing the other?] and between the wine and His blood, and that he teaches that the confirming of faith which sacraments bring, rests upon a virtue [explained more by and by] not such as inheres to the external ordinances themselves, through themselves; but which is Christ's and is dispensed by His Spirit through the word and the sacred signs. I wish therefore in this place to testify to all that read this, that Martin Luther and they who are on his side and follow his doctrine affirm no impanation in the sacred supper, and no local inclusion of the body of Christ in the bread and of His blood

---

in eâ sententiâ fuisse, ut in sacrâ cœnâ nihil exhiberi distribuique sentirem quam panem et vinum, corporis et sanguinis Domini inania symbola et non ipsum etiam corpus et sanguinem Domini...nunquam tamen negavi ea simul a Domino adhiberi ad commendandam nobis Suam misericordiam et exhibendum dona vitæ. Imo hoc ipsum donum, neque id uno in loco. Id unum impugnavi, sacramenta ex se fidem confirmare [*i.e.* have any inherent virtue] quod nimirum est opus Spiritus sancti. At, progressu hujus disputationis, quum Lutherus rem omnem sacramentariam fusius exponeret, vidi illum nec corpus et sanguinem Domini ullâ naturæ copulâ cum pane et vino unire, nec in pane et vino localiter includere; neque sacramentis propriam tribuere virtutem, quâ salutem ex se afferant summentibus ea: verum sacramentalem modo unionem inter corpus Domini et panem, inter sanguinem Ejus et vinum statuere, tum docere confirmationem fidei, quam sacramentis tribuunt, niti virtute; non quæ ipsis inhæreat externis rebus per se; sed quæ sit Christi, et dispensetur Ejus Spiritu per verbum et sacra symbola... Volo itaque et hoc loco testatum omnibus, qui hæc legunt, facere, M. Lutherum et qui vere ab eo stant ejusque doctrinam sequuntur, in sacrâ cœnâ nullam impanationem, nullam quoque corporis Christi in pane, sanguinis in vino

in the wine, nor attribute any saving virtue to the outward acts of the sacraments of themselves, but they lay down a true substantial presence and exhibition of the body and blood of the Lord with the bread and wine in the sacred supper; which doubtless both the very words of the Lord and the testimony of the apostle openly express. [This assumes that the words *cannot* have a figurative or representative sense only.]... For the Lord does not in this return from the heavenly glory and lower Himself into the condition of this life of corruption. They also acknowledge and preach that this is the presence and exhibition of Christ which saves. But that it is by the virtue (going out) from the Lord, not from the outward action, and that it is then received by the receivers, when they by sacraments communicate (with Him) with true faith. Huldéric Zwingel (known by all who know him for most burning earnestness and admirable felicity in rescuing churches from the tyranny and superstition of the pope), when M. Luther and others were contending that the bread is the body of the Lord, had persuaded himself that they were laying down either that the Lord's body is in the bread, or that it is brought to be the same substance with the bread, or that it is locally included in the bread; and therefore was the first to make objection... He (Zwingel) taught, that the Lord (*i.e.* His body) is rather absent from than present in the supper, and that it is more true that the signs are given in it than the body and blood of the Lord. And yet (Zwingel) himself afterwards confessed in my presence, when I was dealing with him concerning an agreement of the churches in this dogma, that the Lord is not simply absent from the supper, or that mere empty signs of the Lord's body and blood are dis-

---

localem inclusionem affirmare, nec ullam externis actionibus sacramentorum ex se virtutem salvificam tribuere, *veram* autem *substantialem* ponunt corporis et sanguinis Domini cum pane et vino in sacrâ cœna *præsentiam* et *exhibitionem*, quam nimirum et ipsa verba Domini et testimonium apostoli aperte exprimunt...Nec enim hic Dominus se reversus e cœlesti gloriâ, in conditionem hujus corruptibilis vitæ demittit. Eam præsentiam et exhibitionem esse salvificam quoque agnoscunt et prædicant, sed id virtute Domini, non externi operis, quodque tum a sumentibus percipitur quum illi verâ fidē sacramentis communicant.... Huldrycus Zuinglius (quem vindicandis Christi ecclesiis a tyrannide et superstitione Papæ fuisse studio flagrantissimo et admirandâ etiam felicitate, norunt quicunque illum norunt) quum M. Lutherus et alii contenderent panem esse corpus Domini, aut in pane esse, persuaserat sibi illos statuere corpus Domini aut cum pane redigi in eandem substantiam, aut in pane localiter includi; eoque contra prius semper objecit...And he blames Zwingel for teaching magis abesse in sacrâ cœnâ Dominum quam adesse, et dari potius symbola hic quam corpus et sanguinem Domini—quum tamen non simpliciter abesse a cœna Dominum, aut inania corporis et sanguinis Domini omnino hic symbola dispensari, ut

pensed in it, and in his defence to the princes of Germany he so wrote." [As if, to recur to Hallam's note, a body can be anything but simply present or absent; and the sacraments anything but having His body in them or not.]

This is a most interesting passage, and some of Zwingel's letters bear it out. Yet not as Hospinian misrepresents Zwingel. The Lutheran peculiarities are very prominent in this treatise.

*ipse postea apud me agentem cum eo de concordia ecclesiarum in hoc dogmate confessus est, et in apologia ad principes Germaniae scripsit.*

(Y.) HENRY BULLINGER. B. 1504. D. 1574.

He is one whose providential escapes from death drew much attention. Among others was his escape from being buried on the supposition of his being dead in the plague. His father was dean and parish priest of Bremgarten. During his schooling at Emmerich, he was kept so short of money that, like Luther, he had to sing and beg from door to door. At the university of Cologne Lombard and Gratian were put before him, and he found in the cathedral library the chief of the fathers, and also some of Luther's awakening writings. The year 1522 saw him a Master of Arts: and when he returned to his father's he gave himself to the study of the Holy Scriptures, till Wolfgang, abbot of Cappel, near Zurich, heard of his powers, and appointed him lecturer there. He left Cappel in 1527 to live at Zurich, rejoicing in the friendship of Zwingel and Leo Juda, and to work on in Greek and Hebrew. It was at Cappel that Zwingel was slain; and Bullinger was chosen to succeed that great minister of Christ. That post he held till his death: and not being forgetful to entertain strangers during the reactionist reign of Mary in England, he thereby was the honoured receiver in succession of nearly all the angels of the English church that were in exile in Switzerland. The plague, which had nearly extinguished his young life, returned upon his house again and again, till his mother, one of his sons, his wife, and three daughters, had fallen victims. These three were the wives severally of Lavater, of Zwingel's son and of Josiah Simler. In 1549 Calvin and Farel met at his house to settle with him a common profession regarding the Lord's supper for the churches of

Zurich and Geneva. The year 1571 brought a severe famine on Zurich and other places; but he outlived his exertions in the mitigation of that calamity for three years. His five decades of sermons were thought worthy of the highest commendation by the heads of the English Church. Every clergyman was required to possess them, in English or in Latin. His influence on the Reformed theology must have been considerable. His appearance was most like that of a refined foreign nobleman: and his conduct was corresponding. He came of a good family in Bremgarten.

*Sermons on the Sacraments.* Cambridge, 1840, and in fifth Decade, Parker Soc.

P. 37. "We read in no place that the Lord said, As often as ye speak, or pronounce, *these my words*, that the substance of the sign shall be made void, and that in the same point of time wherein the words are spoken it shall begin to be the true body and true blood of the Lord under the forms or likenesses of bread and wine: or that, the forms or likenesses and the truth of the signs remaining [Luther], it shall begin at once with the bread and wine to be the very body and blood of Christ. Wherefore in the pronouncing or speaking of the words of the Lord in the supper there is no power or virtue to call down the things signified or to change the things present. These imaginations do rather seem more to maintain superstition than religion. [A passage cited from Chrysostom about a superstition of another kind in this day includes the words.] As the figure of the letters is of power to do nothing, even so is there no power or virtue either in the pronunciation or sound of words.... I know what the adversaries will object... The river Nilus was turned into blood: therefore the bread is turned into flesh, &c.... Whilst Christ our High Bishop did institute His supper in the Gospel, He commanded nothing to be spoken or pronounced, by the virtue of which... the elements might either be changed or the things signified being drawn down from heaven should be present with or joined to the signs, &c.

P. 11. "Cælius supposeth that they are called mysteries, *ὅτι δεῖ μύσαντας τηρεῖν ἔνδον*... *Μυστήριον* is derived of... *μύω* as *ἀποδυτήριον*... of *ἀπό* and *δύω*. [P. 12.] Furthermore, many of the Greek doctors of the church have called our sacraments *σύμβολα*, *Symbola*, which word is also received and very often used of the Latins. It is derived of *συμβάλλω*, that is to say *confero*, to confer, or compare together: [P. 13.] So mystical divinity begins to be called symbolical, because it was enwrapped in more hid and secret mysteries. So that is mystical which is darkly uttered, and in the manner of a riddle, having in it a far more contrary meaning



than by words it seemeth to offer... The ancient writers have therefore hereupon applied this word symbol to our sacraments, because they represent and shew to us the exceeding great and deep mysteries of God, &c. [I do not see in this writer the remark that neither of the Christian sacraments is ever called by this word mystery in the New Testament; and that the word is frequently used for a thing once secret and reserved, or partly so, but now made manifest. There is therefore no Scriptural authority for calling the celebrations of this sacrament, or the bread and the wine, holy mysteries].... An odd man there is among the schoolmen, which teacheth the church this lesson—to wit, that she should remember that she is no lady or mistress over the sacrament, but a servant or minister; and that she hath no more power or authority to institute any form [meaning any new form] of a sacrament than she hath to abrogate any law of God. Aquinas to the same effect. (P. III. Sum. Q. 64, A. 2)... Who knoweth not that the sons of Aaron for offering strange fire were horribly burnt and scorched up with fire that fell down from heaven?

P. 15. “*The sign* ought to have its proceeding from God Himself and not from any manner of men, be they never so many, be they never so clerk-like or learned; be they never so harmless and holy of life. As we do *receive* the word of salvation and grace, it is needful also that we receive the signs of grace.

P. 41. “A man shall nowhere read that ‘to bless’ is as much as to turn the nature of things by the words of God, or otherwise by good words and prayers after a set manner pronounced... To bless (in the Gospels and 1 Cor. x.) is not with the gesture of the hand to make the sign of the cross, or to lay one’s mouth to the bread and cup and in a low voice to whisper out the set syllables of the words of consecration, but to sing praises to God or to give thanks for benefits bestowed upon us.

P. 88. “The sacraments give not that which they have not themselves: but they have not grace and righteousness and heavenly gifts. Therefore they do not give them...and if so be we proceed to include the grace of God within the elements, and the things themselves in the signs by which they are represented, who seeth not with how great danger we shall do the same, especially among the simple sort? For unto *them we shall give occasion of idolatry and to cleave to the visible sign*: of whom also they will require (and ask) that which ought to be asked of God, the Author of all goodness, with minds lifted up to heaven. For whereas it is objected, that *by a certain heavenly covenant* it is appointed by God, that sacraments *should have grace in themselves*; and should from themselves, as by pipes, convey abroad the water of grace unto them that are thirsty—that *is alleged* without warrant of the Scriptures and is repugnant unto true religion... If

by 'bare' they understand things of no force, we openly profess that we have sacraments...full, not void or empty... They are effectual and *not without force* for...with the godly they work the same effect and end whereunto they were ordained of God."

(Z.) ERASTUS (LIEBLER HIS TRUE NAME), A PHYSICIAN.

D. 1583.

The treatise of the German Erastus is so rare, that in these days when the theory of church and state is mooted afresh for discussion a word or two upon it may be both acceptable and useful. Possibly very few precisely know the ground the treatise covers, though almost every one, when he supposes himself to be passing near to it in argument, consults his own reputation by flinging out heartily against both him and his creed. It is almost as much as one's reputation is worth regarding this very important subject, to seem to have a word to say in his favour: but happily for myself I venture to think the line of his argument superficial, *i.e.* hasty and untenable: and yet a theory that was regarded with favour by the judicious Bullinger,—as the appendix to his treatise shews—which is said to have been actually approved and adopted by such noble minds as Dr Lightfoot and Selden, must have some truth in it, which ought to be carefully eliminated and acknowledged. It is said to have been overthrown by Beza in the interest of Swiss Presbyterianism, and by Ursinus the friend of Melancthon on the part of the German Protestant Churches, and on behalf of the English Church by Dr Hammond, when he treated on the power of the keys. The last I have consulted with little success. My copy of Erastus has a pencil note, "Compare Thorndike, vol. i. p. 741." These references may be of use to some. I will confine my remarks to the limits of the treatise itself. We are concerned rather with the theory itself than with its more or less successful refutations. Its publication offended his friends almost as much as it has irritated the ecclesiastical world; and it piqued him very much that his personal friends would not descend to answer his book, but only avoided him very considerably and his book still more. It is now exceedingly scarce. Bauer says "*liber perrarus*," and Vogt "*opus valde rarum et in manibus paucissimorum*." Another book of his exists against "Superstitious remedies and cures by magic."

The full title page of the treatise is,

Explicatio gravissimæ quæstionis, utrum excommunicatio (quatenus religionem intelligentes et amplexantes a sacramentorum usu propter admissum facinus arcet) mandato nitatur Divino an excogitata sit ab hominibus.

Auctore Clariss. viro Thomâ Erasto D. medico.

Opus nunc recens ex ipsius autoris autographo erutum, et in lucem (prout moriens jusserat) editum.

Ad operis calcem adjectæ sunt clarissimorum aliquot theologorum epistolæ, partim ad ipsum autorem scriptæ, partim ad alios, quibus suum rogati de hac re judicium et sententiam proferunt.

Cum indice copiosissimo.

Pesclavii

Apud Baocium Sultacetetum. Anno Salutis

CIO. IO. LXXXIX.

Some say it was put forth by Castelvetro who married his widow and that this is his edition printed, 1589 Puschlaw, the Grisons. A French translation appeared at Amsterdam, 1649.

P. 1. "The body of the faithful is of two kinds; internal and spiritual, and external, *i.e.* a visible polity. The difference between the two is so great that a man contained in one is not necessarily comprehended in the other. For as a man, who has been unjustly ejected from any church, may yet be a member of Christ, so they that be numbered in a visible assembly, are not all also living members of Christ... And indeed we are made members of Christ, *i.e.* are conjoined to the inner and spiritual society of Christ and the faithful, by faith alone, which worketh effectually by love: and we fall out of this same by losing faith. Further none is able to graft us into this society, or exclude us from it, but He who can bestow on us living faith. But we are made partners

#### P. 1.

Duplex fidelium societas; interna scilicet ac spiritualis, et externa seu visibilis et politica...Tantum...inter utramque discrimen est, ut qui in alterutrâ continetur, non etiam comprehendatur in alterâ. Nam ut membrum Christi esse potest, qui injuste ex visibili aliquâ ecclesiâ ejectus est,...ita qui in visibili cœtu numerantur non omnes etiam membra viva sunt Christi...Ac membra quidem Christi efficerunt, *i.e.* internæ spiritualique Christi et fidelium societati jungimur, per solam fidem, quæ per charitatem est efficax: et ex eâdem hac per infidelitatem excidimus. Proinde non potest nos huic inserere aut ex eâdem excludere nisi Qui fidem vivam nobis donare...potest. Externæ vero visibilisque

in the outward and visible church by professing a common faith, and by professing a common doctrine and finally by the use of the common sacraments... He therefore who is cast out from the communion of a church (i.e. who is excommunicated) is removed either from all these three things, or from two of them, or at least from one of them. But from the two first none ought to be repelled; nay rather all are to be invited to them, and by all [proper] means to be brought to them. Wherefore all that remains is that an excommunicated person is prevented from partaking of the sacraments. It is indisputable that other penalties do not belong to the substance of this kind of excommunication. For such penalties may be laid on persons that are not excommunicate, and may happen not to be inflicted on the excommunicated. Therefore the Pope's supporters have beyond this wrongly added on another excommunication, which they have named the greater, and anathema, to this which they entitle 'the less.' And in opposition to open Scripture they have given us its limits as consisting in interdicting the use of churches, of private dealings, and of any (otherwise) lawful act whatever. Whereas the apostle 1 Cor. xiv. openly shews that neither heathen nor any other men are forbidden to hear God's word, or to read it, or to give thanks and pray with Christian people.

Erastus then raises the question, To whom ought the Lord's supper to be refused?

P. 4. "Wherefore God willed every circumcised man (of Israel) to appear three times every year before God, and commanded that all the circumcised should celebrate the passover: nor did He

---

*ecclesiæ consortes reddimur ejusdem fidei professione, ejusdemque doctrinæ professione, denique eorundem sacramentorum usurpatione... Ergo qui ex ecclesiæ communione ejicitur (i.e. qui excommunicatur) vel ab omnibus hisce tribus, vel a duobus, vel ab uno saltem removetur. Sed a duobus primis... repelli nullus debet; quin potius huc invitandi et quavis ratione adducendi sunt omnes. Quocirca relinquitur ut, qui excommunicatur, a solâ... sacramentorum participatione prohibeatur... Alias pœnas non pertinere ad substantiam excommunicationis hujus certum est. Etenim possunt eadem non excommunicatis infligi, et excommunicatis non infligi. Itaque male Pontificii præter hanc excommunicationem (quam ipsi minorem appellant)... aliam insuper addiderunt, quam majorem, et anathema, vocarunt: atque contra apertam scripturam interdictione templorum, privati commercii, et actus cujusvis liciti, definerunt. Quoniam apostolus 1 Cor. xiv. palam ostendit neque ethnicos neque alios quoslibet a Divini verbi auditione, lectione, gratiarum actionibus ac precibus Christianorum prohibitos fuisse.*

P. 4.

Ter coram Deo singulis annis comparere omnem masculum circumcisum quocirca voluit, ac jussit Deus omnes circumcisos celebrare pascha:

shut out anyone from this sacrament or from the other rites, &c. with the exception of those that were unclean. Sacraments were therefore incitements to piety, and further no-one was repelled from them, but rather all were invited to them. [P. 5.] At that time all Israelites used in a certain way to discharge a priestly office, as we find it said in Philo. [P. 6.] Certainly Mosaic uncleanness was not so far a figure of our iniquities, that it signified that we should be coerced and punished by the denial of the sacraments as the polluted in Israel used to be repelled from the temple and from daily intercourse with the rest... For it is not to be disputed that no-one was expelled from the tabernacle and the general assembly on account of immorality. In fact, legal uncleanness was a figure of our distorted and corrupt nature, which could not have been admitted into heaven but for the most pure blood of Christ having taken it away and purified it.

P. 17. "This therefore remains a firm unmoveable and unshaken conclusion that none was removed from the use of the ancient sacraments for moral delinquencies: but the sacraments of the ancients and our own, as far as concerns the things signified, are the same, 1 Cor. x. Wherefore unless it be plain that Moses' law has in this part been abolished or changed, no man is allowed to bring in a contrary custom. We use one of the surest arguments against the Anabaptists when we say that baptism has taken the place of circumcision: so the Lord's supper has taken the place of the eating of the passover. But vices were not punished by denying the passover to offenders, &c. But since it

---

*nec vel ab hoc sacramento vel ab aliis ritibus &c. quonquam exclusit immundis exceptis... Erant ergo sacramenta incitamenta ad pietatem: et proinde ab iis nemo arcebatur; sed ad ea magis invitabantur omnes. P. 5. Fungebantur tunc omnes quodam modo sacerdotis munere, ut de paschate loquens Philo Judæus. P. 6. Certe non sic figuravit Mosaica immunditia nostra flagitia, ut quemadmodum illi inquinati arcebantur a tabernaculo et consuetudine aliorum, ita hac significarit sacramentorum negatione &c. coercenda puniendaque esse... 18 reasons specified. Certum namque est a tabernaculo et cœtu aliorum nullum propter vitiositatem morum depulsum. Demum fuit immunditia legis figura distortæ corruptæque nostræ naturæ, quæ nisi sanguine Christi purissimo ablata purificataque fuerit, in cælum non intromittetur, &c.*

*P. 17.*

*Manet igitur hoc firmum immobile et inconcussum nullum fuisse propter delicta morum a sacramentis (V. T.) remotum... cæterum sacramenta veterum et nostra, quod ad res significatas attinet, eadem sunt. 1 Cor. x. Quare nisi legem Mosis hac in parte vel abolitum vel mutatam constet, contrarium inducere nulli homini licebit... Adversus anabaptistas firmissimo hoc recte utimur argumento, quia circumcisioni baptismus successerit... ita... Paschatis esui successit cœna Dominica. At paschatis negatione vitia non puniebantur, &c. Quæ cum nullibi legatur*

is nowhere read that these rules are annulled or abolished neither are men to be punished by the denial of the Lord's supper, &c. [P. 18.] We do not read anywhere of Christ our Saviour and Lord having in the same way interdicted the use of the sacraments to anyone. Further since the law (of Moses) commanded all except the unclean to celebrate the passover, Christ Himself willed not to forbid it to anyone. But it is plain that He never blamed any because they were using the sacraments (of the old law) and were frequently (or in crowds) present at the temple and the sacrifices, &c. He always went into the same temple with the Pharisees and scribes, &c., &c., with the bad as well as with the good, when He stood at (assisted at) the same sacrifices with them. He used the same sacraments as all the people used. For the same reason He did not repel Judas also His own betrayer, from eating with Him at His last feast of the lamb of the passover.

P. 20. "Christ wills not that His kingdom in these lands among Christians should be circumscribed within narrower boundaries (I am speaking of His external kingdom) than He formerly wished it to be shut in and defined among the Jews. Further as God commanded that all the circumcised should have the external participation of the same sacraments and ceremonies, but commanded that the wicked be controlled and punished by the sword and by other penalties, so also Christ wills that all the baptized or Christians, who have right and pure opinions on religion, should use the same outward ceremonies and sacraments: but that wicked men be punished by the magistrate with death, banishment, imprisonment and other such penalties. As to the

*antiquata aut abolita, ne cœnæ quidem Dominicæ negatione puniendi sunt, &c. P. 18. Christus Servator ac Dominus noster eodem modo nulli usum [not usu] sacramentorum interdixisse legitur... Proinde cum juberet lex omnes pascha celebrare præter immundos, prohibere Ipse nulli noluit. Constat autem nullos unquam reprehendisse quod sacramentis (V. T.) uterentur et frequenter adessent templo et sacrificiis, &c. In idem semper templum ingressus est cum Scribis et Phariseis... malis pariter et bonis... iisdem cum his sacrificiis astitit: eadem cum universo populo sacramenta usurpavit, &c. Hac eâdem de causâ Judam quoque proditorem Suum a postremo agni esu non arcuit, &c.*

P. 20.

Non vult angustioribus in his terris finibus regnum circumscribi Christus (de externo loquor) inter Christianos, quam voluerit olim concludi et definiri inter Judæos. Proinde sicut jussit Deus omnes circumcisos externe participare eisdem sacramentis ac cæremoniis, sceleratos autem gladio aliisque pœnis coerceri plectique mandavit, ita vult etiam Christus omnes baptizatos seu Christianos, recte pureque de religione sentientes, iisdem externis cæremoniis et sacramentis uti; flagitiosos autem a magistratu morte exilio carcere aliisque pœnis talibus puniri.

apostles...They are not found in any passage to have either taught or practised this (lesser) excommunication. [P. 21.] No arguments are found in Paul that lead to the opposite opinion... 1 Cor. viii., the apostle neither excluded those who thought that an idol is something nor, &c.

P. 23. "The class of eaters [of the supper] by opposite differences divides itself into two species, to those namely that eat worthily and those that eat unworthily. Paul does not order either not to eat, but he desires all to eat worthily... If he had wished in this manner to repel the criminal, 2 Ep. xii., xiii., he would have ordered that they should be removed from the sacraments, till they were amended.

P. 25. Why then should we not desire to keep back anyone from hearing the word, [and yet labour to repel them] from the sacraments, especially from the Lord's supper? I am speaking neither about Turks nor about unconverted persons, but about those that have been called by God into His church and grafted into it, approving its doctrine, and at least outwardly desiring to use its sacraments aright. Matt. xviii., Christ is giving order that, if any chance to be obliged to carry their cause to a magistrate, they should not go to accuse their Jewish brethren before the Romans, till they sought the help of their own magistrate in vain, &c., see too 1 Cor. vi.

P. 40. "'Tell it to the church' has no other meaning than 'Tell it to the magistrate of thy own people.'

Apud apostolos...nullo in loco reperiuntur excommunicationem hanc vel docuisse vel exercuisse apostoli...P. 21. Pro diversâ opinione nulla apud Paulum inveniri argumenta...1 Cor. viii., neque illos exclusit apostolus qui aliquid putabant esse idola, neque, &c. &c.

P. 23.

Edentium genus dividit per oppositas differentias in duas species, in eos scilicet qui digne edunt, et eos qui indigne edunt: neutros jubet non edere, sed omnes cupit digne edere...Si hoc modo...coercere facinorosos, 2 Ep. xii., xiii., voluisset, jussisset eos a sacramentis usque ad emendationem amoveri.

P. 25.

Cur ergo a verbo neminem, a sacramentis præsertim a cœnâ Domini aliquos arcere studemus?...nec ego de Turcis, aut non conversis loquor, sed de vocatis a Deo in ecclesiam Suam et huic insertis, doctrinam probantibus, et sacramentis rite uti, externe saltem, cupientibus... Matt. xviii. Præcipit (Christus), Si forte ad magistratum deferre causam cogantur ne fratres suos Judæos apud Romanos accusent, priusquam proprii magistratus auxilium frustra imploraverunt, &c. See 1 Cor. vi.

P. 40.

"Dic ecclesiæ," non aliud significare, quam, "Dic populi tui magis-tratui."

P. 43. "Thus then it has been firmly and truly proved that Christ was not discoursing on excluding persons from sacraments.

P. 45. Regarding 1 Cor. v. Erastus is forced to confess, "Further Paul wills not their exclusion from the supper but from the whole of the Christian life." [What is this but the greater and lesser excommunications to which Erastus objected, p. 3? and does not this include the sacrament? *Majus continet minus.* Yet in conclusion, p. 62, he denies this, saying a jury might be formed in a church in a heathen land, to punish with secular separations; but "from sacraments enjoined of God," he says, "none who desire to approach may lawfully be repelled." Surely Christian sacraments are a part of "*vita Christiana*:" absolute freedom of access to the second sacrament cannot be maintained.—This is just at the end of his six Theses: a commentary and defence follow.]

Does it not seem very apparent that the term "Erastianism" is not quite what the English public takes it to be, *viz.* the negation of all clerical authority? For the precedent preferred in the treatise of Erastus is the law of Moses; and did that economy establish anything like the state of lay supremacy that men now denounce as Erastianism? Had the Mosaic priesthood no authority? It may be true that in Israel there was a royal supremacy: but Erastus did not contend for it in this treatise. He did not assail clericalism at any point except this. Was not his one serious error his own particular crotchet of free and unrestrained liberty of communion, assuming that, because there was no moral winnowing of the chaff from the wheat in respect of participation in the sacraments under the old law, therefore we are to have none under the Christian? an assumption not easily to be granted. If this assumption then is refused, the whole question of

P. 43.

*Sic ergo firme et vere probatum est Christum (Matt. xviii.) non de exclusionē a sacramentis...disserere.*

P. 45, on 1 Cor. v.

Erastus fails entirely: for he is obliged to say, *Proinde non e cœnâ excludi sed e medio (sanctus Paulus) eum vult tolli: non loquitur ibi Paulus de cœnâ, sed de totâ Christianâ vitâ.*

P. 62.

*A sacramentis, a Deo institutis, accedere cupientes arcere non poterunt.*



the power of excommunication lies open to be settled by the analogy of the faith. At any rate it is curious that we in our full-grown communities find it very hard not to practise that very absence of excommunicating at which Erastus aimed. The only modern trial at law has failed. I have lived 70 years and not seen in England a case of excommunication in that national Christian society in which I live.

(AA.) BISHOP EDMUND GESTE OF SALISBURY.

B. 1514. D. 1578.

Henry Geast Dugdale, Barrister, of the Middle Temple, has put forth a book containing a short life of the said bishop and eight important documents in support of Strype's assertion, that this bishop was appointed by Cecil during the Primate Parker's illness to compare the Communion Services in King Edward's two Prayer-books with the ancient Liturgies, and to produce "a new Service-book." Three of the eight documents are the bishop's letters to the Primate and Cecil, and a letter from Cecil when the bishop's work was done. The letter to Cecil contains his reasons for the changes. The first document is the bishop's entire "treatise against the prevee Masse, in behalfe and furtheraunce of the mooste holye Communyon. 1548." Mr Dugdale thinks that his good ancestor has lost the grateful remembrance which he merits from Englishmen, and the motto of the book is, *Palmarum qui meruit ferat*. Since this is in no wise a work on philology, I have not thought it worth while to trouble the reader with the ancient spelling, deeming the sample given in the title will be sufficient for most readers; and in parts it would need a translation almost as much as Latin or Greek.

He was born at Northallerton and educated at York, Eton and Cambridge. He became Vice-Provost of King's in 1544. Bale mentions other works by him. He left his library to his cathedral.

London, 1840.

"Our private massing is a sacrilege most unsuited heinous and detestable: forasmuch as it is a stealth (stealing) of holy things, not of the basest suit, as candlesticks censers crosses and chalices be, but of the holiest and chiefest kind, *viz.* of Christ,

of the Holy Ghost, of true religion, of faith, of godliness, reposed and placed not in a stony temple or altar but in a Christian and faithful heart, which is justly esteemed more precious and holy than a thousand stone temples or altars, which after the report of Paul is the temple of the Holy Ghost, and the mansion place of the blessed Trinity, as Christ Himself witnesseth in St John.

P. 78. "These words 'Take, eat, &c.' be no words of making the Lord's body, but of presenting and exhibiting the same to the receivers of the right supper of the Lord... Now after the due report and utterance of the said words by the minister upon the aforementioned bread and wine, they be consecrate and made, of profane, the holy sacraments, exhibitives of Christ's body and blood. Thus also meant the fathers by these words consecration and making in the sacrament. [This is the assertion mostly maintained by our Reformers as well as by Geste; with what accuracy the reader of this volume can judge.] Now to transubstantiation or turn kind [written *tourne kynde*]... How can this stand with our faith that Christ... should be again made of the bread, (a vile creature), through the exchange of the nature thereof into His? How were it true that the blessed wine and broken bread were bread and wine, as Paul termeth them, if their nature were thoroughly altered into Christ's body and blood? Can they be bread and wine still, without they retain their natures still? Can they be rightly named bread and wine without their own proper matter (or matter) and substance, in respect whereof they are so named? Do they not still appear to our senses bread and wine, notwithstanding they are become the sacraments, exhibitives of Christ's body and blood? Who ever saw the exchange of any substance without the alteration of his (its) accidents and outward shape? When Christ turned marvellously water into wine, it had not only the nature of wine, but the external form also taste colour and fashion of wine, and no semblance of water at all. Aaron's rod, being altered into an adder, had not only the substance thereof, but also the outward fashion of the same, and no similitude of a rod at all. The water, which Moses changed into blood, as it was in nature blood, so outwardly it seemed blood. Even so, unquestionless, should your bread and wine leave their outward shape with their inward substance, if they were altered into Christ's body and blood. By reason whereof, sith they retain their accidents, needs must they also retain wonted substance. Can there be any sacrament, as St Augustine saith, without therein the due element and fit word of God belonging thereunto be jointly coupled together? No verily. How then can the outward appearance of bread and wine without their inward substance be the sacraments of Christ's body and blood? For the outward appearance of bread and wine be none (no) elements, but only the external shews of

the same... In the consecrated bread are worms engendered, &c. Each worm is a substance and none accident. Therefore (they) cannot be engendered or fed of an accident, but of a substance alone. In respect whereof, sith the worms breed and feed, not in Christ's body, but in the consecrate bread, we must remediless acknowledge in the same bread to continue the very proper substance thereof. [Then follows close pleading with the Romanist, in which occur expressions hardly capable of a spiritual, *i.e.* a mental or subjective, construction. They seem to me to involve a belief in our receiving into us "the natural body of Christ."] The bread and wine be sacraments of Christ's body and blood, ordained of Him purposely to instruct our senses outwardly, what is wrought inwardly by the said body and blood in the soul. For their use is to declare to our outward senses assuredly, that as the received bread and wine nourish strengthen and glad our bodies, so Christ's body eaten and His blood drunken accordingly do our souls. [Had our Reformers been so bold as to put in one word Christ's body *spiritually* eaten, &c. or Christ's body eaten and His blood drunken *in a figure*, gainsayers to Protestant truth must have hidden their diminished heads and stilled their reluctant tongues. How much harder it is to insert similar words everywhere now! But is there not a cause? But again hear Geste.]

P. 81. "The broken bread and blessed wine be institute purposely to resolve and ascertain our senses, that we as materially and truly, though not grosslier sensibly, but ghostly receive and eat Christ's body and drink His blood."

Here is confusion worse confounded, so that even the insertion of the word ghostly, which is a synonym for spiritually, does not avail to clear the sentence to a Protestant sense. For Geste actually says, We ghostly receive Christ's body as materially and truly as we do the bread and wine.

Of what use is it to add "not grosslier sensibly"? For in saying "materially and truly" he might as well add every possible adverb. I found a great divine take the stand on believing the natural presence of Christ's body, but denying the material sense. But Bishop Geste here says, as materially and truly as the bread and wine. Is it not time for the defenders to quit this amphibious mode of life, and to use, in explaining the language of Jesus and Paul, expressions easy to be understood instead of expressions that provoke and almost necessitate misunderstanding? Either the body and blood of Christ are present on earth now, or they are in Heaven only till He return a second time, *ἐκ δευτέρου*. If the

latter alternative be true, then only the Godhead of Christ is present in the Lord's supper or in our souls after receiving. And if we hold this to be the truth is it not time to renounce all equivocal terms: in short to erase them from our teaching and make our churches appear what all our Reformers really thought with imperfect vision yearned to make them, *i.e.* decisively and unmistakably opposed to the corrupt traditions that had found place in the church's writings?

P. 91. "There is another (prayer in the Canon of the Mass) that questionless argueth the same... 'O holy Trinity, perform that this sacrifice which I unworthy have offered to the eyes of Thy Divine majesty may be acceptable to Thee and also through Thy mercy propitiatory, that is to say mercy-working to me and all them for whom I have sacrificed it'... If we heartily thought with God the mass sacrificing were not propitiatory we would not thoroughly maintain the said mass-canon; we would not say, We offer therewith Christ's body to our redemption: we would not instant (urge) God as we do to enforce our sacrificing of Christ (to make it real) to purchase His mercy.

P. 94. "Questionless their meaning is that the said sacrifice appeaseth God's ire and indignation and cleanseth sin.

P. 97. "But what need I argue the said sacrifice to be unfruitful? The catholics themselves in conclusion grant the same while they avouch the entire fruit and virtue of the present mass to consist in the appllial of Christ's merits unto us, otherwise utterly divided of the same, once merited upon the cross in general for all men. Which is the sacrament and not the sacrifice. For in the sacrifice there is nothing applied and rendered unto us, but to God alone. Otherwise it is no sacrifice at all.

P. 99. "It is plain the mass-sacrifice is not grounded upon God's written word, and so never acceptable nor serviceable to God nor fruitful to man. For why? Whoso worshippeth God without His special word for the same, worshippeth Him without faith, by reason true faith issueth only from God's written word, Rom. x., Faith cometh by hearing and the hearing by God's word: and whoso worshippeth without faith sinneth.

P. 123. "Where is there any commandment yea or sufferance to take the Lord's supper alone? Certes not in the holy scripture...let the masser report them (the words of the institution) in his private mass as often as him list, they be not the Lord's words. For that "Take ye" "Eat ye" "Drink ye" imply both a commandment and a second person to the receipt of the Lord's body and blood and to the consecration of the sacrament of the same. Which both want

[i.e. are wanting] in the priest's supper and so it is not the Lord's. ... He had (bade) us sever the consecrated bread charitably among us, and not each of us (priests) to reserve it to himself and to eat uncharitably all alone ... He had us take and eat His body and not to worship it and uplift it ... But the priest doth not only eat it for himself but for others also, both quick and dead ... Can another man's eating relieve my hunger? Can another man's drinking relieve my thirst?"

(BB.) ARCHBISHOP EDMUND GRINDAL. B. 1529. D. 1583.

His case is an encouragement to all who take books a-walking : for an arrow would have cut short his career in his boyhood, had it not been intercepted according to Divine Providence by a book in his breast-pocket, Acts xxvii. The next most interesting point is his being engaged in 1549 in two discussions on the radical Protestant question, Is the clause, "This is My body," to be taken literally or figuratively? In his exile in Mary's reign he applied himself to collect authentic historic materials of the two last reigns which he supplied to Fox. On his return Elizabeth set him on the Prayer-book Committee. At Sir T. Smith's was his friend Sandys, with Pilkington, Cox, and Whitehead. Everyone knows his rise through London and York to Canterbury, and his contention with the Queen about the public prophesyings and his glory of dying poor. To praise him were impertinence.

He was a native of Cumberland, and a graduate of Magdalene College, Christ's and Pembroke. Of the last society he rose to be Master. The account of him in my late friend Mr Marsden's Early Puritans is very interesting. No wonder Queen Elizabeth loved and promoted him.

P. 47. Parker Society. "When the sacrament was dealt (by Christ) none of them all crouched down and took it for His God... but took it and ate it, knowing that it was a sacrament and a remembrance of Christ's body. Yea the old councils forbad that no man *should kneel down* at the time of the communion, fearing that it should be an occasion of idolatry.

P. 57. "Christ took bread and left it bread; the priest taketh bread and conjureth it away. Christ gave a sacrament to strengthen faith; the priest giveth a sacrifice to redeem men's souls. Christ gave it to be eaten; the priest giveth it to be worshipped. And

to conclude, Christ gave bread; the priest saith he giveth a god. Herein is difference enough between Christ and the priests.

*Discussion, 1549.*

P. 198. "If to eat the body of Christ is a figurative speech ... then the words, This is My body, are a figurative speech also.

P. 196. "Glin says, The nature of it is changed, and that miraculously. Grindal. [Yes], If it be the natural and substantial body of Christ.

P. 49. "In the Acts of the Apostles St Peter saith that Christ must needs keep the heaven till all be ended ... and no promise have we that He will come down at every priest's calling.

P. 54. "(Bede) speaketh in Christ's person, 'Therefore shall you see Me but a little while after My resurrection, because I will not still abide in the earth bodily, but in the manhood ... ascend up to heaven.' What needeth more words? &c.... The body of Christ is ascended into heaven, and there remaineth at the right hand of the Father, and cannot be in more than one place. I do conclude that the sacrament is not the body of Christ: First, because the sacrament is not in heaven, neither sitteth at the Father's right hand. Moreover because it is in a hundred boxes, whereas Christ's body filleth but one place. Furthermore if the bread were turned into the body of Christ, then it would necessarily follow, that impenitent persons receive the body of Christ ... [The Popish replicant who is called "Custom" says], Marry and so they do, for St Paul saith plainly, they receive the body of Christ to their own confusion. ["Verity" answers], No: not so. They are not St Paul's words; but he saith, 'Whoso eateth this bread and drinketh this cup unworthily, he is guilty of the body and blood of the Lord,' *i.e.* of the death of Christ. *Pœnas dabit mortis Christi, Ambrose.*"

It is to be regretted that Grindal did not give us an elaborate treatise on the Lord's supper. It might have stood by the side of the pure Scriptural teaching of parts of Usher and Barrow and Sandys.

(CC.) ARCHBISHOP EDWIN SANDYS OF YORK. B. 1519. D. 1588.

Educated at St John's, he became Master of Catharine. His name is otherwise spelt Sandes. His native place is Furness Fells in Lancashire; for the house of his birth was probably Eastthwaite Hall, which gives a likelihood that he was instructed at Furness Abbey School. He was buried in Southwell church, Notts. At

the accession of Queen Elizabeth he was made Bishop of Worcester, and then translated after Grindal to London, and again as his successor at York. He must have been a prelate of sterner stuff than common, for when he was Vice-Chancellor at Cambridge at the death of Edward VI., he even refused to proclaim Mary queen. He was three quarters of a year in prison and fled to Germany. He aided in preparing what is called the Bishops' Bible after Tyndale's death and his own return in Elizabeth's reign. Fox's account of his sermon at Mary's accession is touching. Abel Redivivus has some other characteristic narrations.

P. 302. Parker Society. "The graces of God, purchased for us by Christ, are offered unto us by the word; so are they also most lively and effectually by the sacraments....In the eucharist or supper of the Lord our corporeal tasting of the visible elements bread and wine sheweth the heavenly nourishing of our souls unto life by the mystical participation of the glorious body and blood of Christ...All the graces *which may flow from the body and blood of Christ* are here in a mystery not represented only but presented to us...giving to the signs bread and wine the names which are proper to the things signified.

Sermon IV. p. 87. "The *worthy receiving* of His sacraments is not only a *sealing* of His grace unto us, but also a testifying of our godliness unto Him...These are pledges and assurances of remission of sins and salvation, purchased by the death of Christ. These are *God's seals*, added unto His most certain promises for the confirmation of our weak faith, weak by reason of the infirmity of the flesh; for if we were spiritual, saith Chrysostom (Hom. 82, VII. 787, Paris, 1727), we should not need these *corporeal signs*... [P. 88.] In this sacrament there are two things, a visible sign and an invisible grace; there is a visible sacramental sign of bread and wine, and there is the thing and matter signified, *viz.* the body and blood of Christ: there is an earthly matter, and a *heavenly matter*. The outward sign is common to us all, as well the bad as the good. Judas received the Lord's bread, but not *that bread, which the Lord is* to the faithful receiver. The *spiritual part, that which feedeth the soul*, only the faithful do receive. For he cannot be partaker of *the body of Christ*, which is no member of Christ's body. This food, offered to us at the Lord's table, is to feed our souls withal: it is meat for the mind and not for the belly. Our souls, *being spiritual*, can neither receive nor digest *that which is corporal*: they feed only upon spiritual food. [What a pity Sandys did not add here, And so the *natural body* of Christ is not eaten by the believer except as in a figure!] It is the spiritual eating that giveth life. 'The

'flesh,' saith Christ, 'doth nothing profit.' [With this text under hand, why did he not speak plainly what we may all fancy that he meant?] We must lift up ourselves from these external and earthly signs [*i.e.* the bread and wine] and like eagles fly up and soar aloft, there to feed on *Christ*, which sitteth on the right hand of His Father, whom *the heavens shall keep* unto the latter day. From thence and *from no other altar* shall He come [compare Fulke] in His natural body to judge both quick and dead. His natural body is local, for else it were not a natural body: His body is therefore not here, for a natural body doth not occupy sundry places at once. Here we have a sacrament, a sign, a memorial, a commemoration, a representation, a figure *effectual*, of the body and blood of Christ. [Then he quotes Augustine.]

P. 89. "Thy teeth shall not do Him violence, nor thy stomach contain His *glorious* body [He before called it a *natural* body even at judgment]. Thy faith must reach up into heaven. By faith *He* is seen: by faith He is *touched*: by faith He is *digested*. Spiritually by faith we *feed upon Christ*, when we steadfastly believe that His body was broken and His blood shed for us upon the cross: by which sacrifice offered once for all, as sufficient for all, our sins *were* freely remitted, &c. &c. Time will not suffer me to let you see the absurdities of the popish unsavoury opinions on this matter, dreaming evermore with the gross Capernaïtes, of a *carnal* and a *fleshly eating*. [This confirms my belief that the archbishop did not think that Christ's body in any form whatever, natural or glorious, becomes food to the soul: and yet he knew that many of the fathers who believe that it does are yet most forcible in objecting to the gross Capernaïte eating]. Behold the one part of this sacrament is called bread, the other a cup." [That does not convince those fathers at all, nor those who now follow them.]

Bertram and Theodoret are then cited, saying that bread and wine remain. Luther believed that, and Chemnitz: and yet held that Christ's words, This is My body, are to be taken in their most literal and natural sense and not in a figurative sense only. See the long citation from the latter. We can but say in conclusion, Would that such a man as Sandys had gone straight to the matter, and denied that the body of Christ is in any form given even to the believer: and that all expressions seeming to imply *something of this kind* are simply figurative of the receiving of all spiritual blessings.

(DD.) JOHN WHITGIFT, PRIMATE. B. 1530. D. 1604.

Of all our eminent primates he is one of the most eminent. His mark seems to have been sobriety of judgment both in tempo-



ral matters and in doctrine. It is a singular circumstance that he had an uncle in the position of Abbot of Wellows, whom he seems to have watched till he received a bias from him favourable to the changes that were evidently coming on the country, for the uncle is said to have been struck by not finding the accustomed Romish religion in the Bible. Perhaps he learned from that relative the inclination to caution, by which under the advice of Dr Pearne, Master of Peterhouse, he avoided the necessity of repairing to the Continent in the perilous time of Mary's reign, and "at the rising of our occidental star" came forth uncompromised. It is worthy of notice that when he was living in the house of a Popish relative, in his youth, while Henry VIII. was still alive, he dared to offend her by refusing to go with her to the morning mass though his refusal caused him to be expelled from her house. His countenance is one that you look at with increasing satisfaction. Calm and sincere and determined, with no mark of that excessive power which subjects the entire expression to itself and sins against harmony. We do not wonder that the Queen gave him the name of her black husband, but the royal wit might have restrained itself from calling him "a white gift."

The three volumes of his works furnish little aid in our enquiry: but his freedom from prejudice in relation to Zwingel will appear in the Third Part of this book. He became Master of Trinity and Dean of Lincoln, and then Bishop of Worcester, and was then raised to the primacy. He had been appointed in succession to two of the four Divinity Professorships at Cambridge and to the Mastership of Pembroke, before he became Master of Trinity. He was a native of Great Grimsby. Masters does well to mention that he promoted the triumph of Hooker's great work, though it superseded his own treatise on the same subject—shewing humility like John the Baptist:—nor can we forget his dying words, *Pro ecclesiâ Dei*, twice repeated, a faultless exclamation of the very highest strain. As an undergraduate he had Ridley for the Master of his College, and John Bradford for his Tutor. He died of a cold caught in an official journey in a barge on the Thames.

*Defence of Ans. to Admonition, U. T. C. Parker Society.*

P. 382. "It is a certain and true doctrine of all such as profess the gospel that the outward signs of the sacrament *do not contain in them grace* neither yet that the grace of God is of

necessity tied to them, but only that they be *seals of God's promises*, notes of Christianity, testimonials and *effectual signs* of the grace of God and of our redemption in Christ Jesus, *by the which the Spirit of God doth invisibly work* in us not only the increase of faith but confirmation also.

P. 383. "It is certainly true that the mystical washing away of sin is *proper to the work of God in the blood of Christ*.

P. 382. "Bread and wine in the eucharist be sacraments (sanctified to another use than usual bread and wine) by the which *as by instruments we be fed* to eternal life—in Scripture usually called by the names of those things of which they be signs."

The propriety of calling *the signs* effectual or efficacious must depend on the amount of meaning attached to the word. If it only means useful, beneficial, in a word *helpful because they are significant* or suggestive of Christ's grace and benefit, everyone would delight in the expression; but if it means having effective power in themselves to do us good or to *convey* the benefit to us, the Archbishop, by what he said in extract (1), would reject the term. It would involve the opus operatum doctrine, since if the signs themselves convey the grace, it cannot depend upon faith in us.

(EE.) JAMES PILKINGTON, B.D., BISHOP OF DURHAM.

B. 1520. D. 1575.

Master of St John's, Cambridge: read lectures in the schools: also at Basle during Mary's reign. On returning to England was on the Commission for revising the Prayer-Book. His father had a landed estate at Rivington in Lancashire where he was born.

*Questions and answers in his works.* Parker Society.

Q. x. "He denies that the Catholic church teaches to receive Christ's body consecrated at mass with the sign of the holy cross, or that we give nothing but bare bread and wine...With what grace can they say we have no consecration?...If they have any in their mass, we have it also. For if consecration stand in words, we have all the words that their mass, the Gospel, St Paul, or the Apostles had. Read Matthew, Mark, Luke and the xith to the Corinthians, what is written of the Lord's supper, and see whether

our consecration want any one word that is in either of them. Then ...why is there no consecration with us? Gregory says the apostles consecrated only with the Lord's Prayer, II. p. 960, Basle 1564: and that (*i.e.* the Lord's prayer) we use as well as they. Jan Duns [Scotus] says the words of consecrating the bread be these, This is My body, and those words we have too... Further he says, Neither Christ nor the Church has defined which be the words of *consecrating the cup*: therefore he will not determine them. What are we now the worse than their own doctors, and why.. say...the church has defined it? Duns knew it not in his time nor the church. Where is one so mad, except priests, to say that a consecration stands in crossing? or that 'benedicite' is to make a cross? Prove it if ye can...Deceive not the people."

(FF.) DR WILLIAM FULKE, 11 years Master of St John's,  
Cambridge. D. 1589.

Thirty-two years after his death Francis Wright, his successor in the living of Dennington, Sac. Theol. Prof. (*i.e.* D.D.), erected a monument to him in his church, which only commemorates him as doctor. We may therefore infer that the report of Fulke's holding one of the Cambridge Professorships of Divinity is untrue. His learning and his work need no false laurels. His great work, *The Rhemish New Testament and Notes*, confuted by his comments, will ever stand without a parallel.

*New Test. (Dr F.'s version) and Rhem. Test. and its Notes confuted.*  
London, 1633.

*Rhem.* 11, John vi. 58. He that eateth this bread, &c. "By this place the holy council proveth that for the grace and effect of the sacrament, which is the life of the soul, there is no difference whether a man receive both kinds or one (Conc. Trid. Sess. XXII. 1), because our Saviour, Who before attributed life to the eating and drinking of the body and blood, doth here also affirm the same effect, *i.e.* life everlasting, to come of eating only under one form. Therefore the heretics be seditious calumniators, that would make the people believe the catholic church and priests to have defrauded them of the grace and benefit of one of the kinds in the sacrament. Nay: it is they that have defrauded the world by taking away the real substance of Christ, and the grace from one kind, and both kinds and from all other sacraments. The church doth only, by the wisdom of God's Spirit and by the instruction of Christ and His apostles according to time and place, for God's most honour, the reverence of the sacrament and the

people's profit, thereby dispose of the manner and order how the priest, how the people shall receive, and all other particular points, which 'Himself (saith S. Aug. Ep. 118: 6 ad Jan.) did not take 'order for, that He might commit that to the apostles, by whom 'He was to dispose His church's affairs.' Though both He and the apostles and fathers of the primitive church set us *an example of receiving under one kind*. Christ at Emmaus, the apostles Acts ii. 46, the primitive church in giving the blood only to children, &c., &c. Whereby the church *being warranted*, and in the rule of such things fully taught by God's Spirit as well as for the reproving of certain heresies, that Christ, God and man, was not whole, and all, in every part of the sacrament, as specially for that the Christian people being now enlarged, and the communicants often so many at once, that neither so much wine could be conveniently consecrated nor without manifold accidents of shedding or abusing be received (whereof the protestants have no regard because it is but common wine which they occupy). But the church, knowing it to be Christ's own blood *must have all dreadful regard*. Therefore I say she hath decreed, and for some hundred of years put in use that the priest saying mass should always both consecrate and also receive both kinds, &c., &c.: but the laymen and the clergy also when they do not execute or say mass themselves should receive in one kind, being thereby no less partakers of Christ's whole person and grace than if they received both, as St Paul says, 1 Cor. x. 18. "He that eateth the hostes is partaker of the altar" (Rhem. version).

*Fulke's Refutation.* "Drinking is here (v. 58) to be understood, though it be not expressed. You may as well conclude that the priest need not consecrate but in one kind. Neither doth Aug. say that the church hath power to alter Christ's institution but to dispose of things that are accidental... which pertain not to the substance of Christ's institution, &c., &c. Luke xxiv. 30. In expounding the same text, *you dare not affirm it to be the sacrament*: and if it were, you might thereby prove that Christ did consecrate in one kind also, &c., &c.... That the sick person was houselled in one kind, it is contrary to what Eusebius saith (case Serapion), &c., &c. The causes of your practice proceed of anti-christian pride, in that you will seem wiser than Christ, Who instituted the sacrament in both kinds. Then on 1 Cor. x. 18, Who will grant it was lawful to abstain from the drink-offerings?

*Rhem. 12, 1 Cor. xi.* "When the words of consecration be by the said impiety of the protestants thus removed from the elements, no marvel if Christ's holy body and blood be not there, or that it is now no more a sacrament, but common bread and wine. So that they unjustly charge the catholic church with defrauding the people of one piece of the sacrament, neither following Christ

as they pretend nor St Paul nor any evangelist, but their own, detestable sect; having boldly defaced the whole institution not in any accidental blessing or consecration but in the very substance and all. The right name is gone. The due elements both gone. No blessing or consecration or other action over them. The forms be gone, and consequently the body and blood, the sacrament and the sacrifice. *Rhem.* 13. By these words (*This do* in rememb. &c.) authority and power is given unto the apostles, and by the like in the sacrament of orders to all lawful priests only. No marvel then that the new heretical ministers, being laymen, give the people nothing but bread and wine, profane naked and natural elements, void of sacrament and all grace. *Rhem.* 14. The adversaries... improperly name the whole sacrament and ministration thereof, calling it the communion; which name they rather than any other give to make the ignorant believe that many must communicate together, as though it were so called because it is common to many, by which conclusion they take away the receiving of the sacrament alone, of the sick alone, of reserving the consecrated host and the whole sacrament. Against which deceit know that this part of the mass is not called communion for that many should concur together always in the external sacrament, but that we do communicate or join together in unity and perfect fellowship of one body with all Christian men in the world—with all we say that eat it through the whole church and not with them only that eat with us at one time.

*Fulke.* "How are they partakers among you, who do not eat it? the priest only; *Rhem.* 18, 'not discerning the body, &c.' Because he putteth no difference or distinction between Christ His high meal and others; and therefore S. Aug. saith, Ep. 118, c. 3, that is he that the apostle saith shall be damned that doth not by singular veneration make a difference between this meat and all others. And again on Ps. xcvi., No man eateth it before he adore it: and S. Ambrose, l. 3, c. 12, de Sp. San., We adore the flesh of Christ in the mysteries. S. Chrysostom, Hom. 24, on 1 Cor., We adore Him on the altar as the sages did in the manger. S. Nazianzen in Epitaph. Gorgoniæ, My sister called on Him which is worshipped on the altar. Theodoret, Dialog. 2 in Conf., The mystical tokens be adored. Denis. *This apostle's scholar* made solemn invocation of the sacrament after consecration, &c., &c., including Cyril Jerus. Mystagog. 5 in fine and Orig. Hom. XIII. on Exod. xxv. For this sacred provision is made that if any hosts or parts of the sacrament do remain unreceived they be most religiously reserved with all honour and diligence possible, and for this example of consciences confess a continence; and as S. Aug. saith, receiving it fasting. Thus do we catholics and the holy church of God discern the holy body and blood of God by St Paul's rule, &c. [We give Fulke's reasonings, but do not always concur.]

*Fulke*, five pages folio of small print—including, This Evagrius testifieth by an old custom of the church of Constantinople, that what remained after the communion was given to young children that went to school.

*Note.* The arguments of the Rhemish divines I have not scrupled to exhibit comparatively at full—believing it of the first consequence to exhibit them; and not fearing to do so even with only a hint of their opponents' utterances here and there.

*Fulke.* Parker Society, p. 241. Reasons for not translating *πρεσβύτερος* *priest*. "In denying the blasphemous sacrifice of the Popish mass with the altar and priesthood that thereto belongeth we use no wily policy, but with open mouth at all times and places we cry out upon it... Therefore did not Christ at His last supper institute any external propitiatory sacrifice of His body and blood, but a sacrament joined with the spiritual sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.

P. 242. "Presbyter should signify nothing but an elder, &c. But by usurpation (priest) is commonly taken to signify a sacrificer, as *ιερεύς* in Greek and *sacerdos* in Latin; by which names (*i.e.* the former name) the ministers of the gospel are never called by the Holy Ghost... We call the sacrificers of the Old Testament and of the Gentiles also (because the Scripture calleth them by one name) *cohanim*, *ιερείς*, but because the Scripture calleth the ministers of the New Testament by divers other names and never by the name of *ιερείς*, we thought it necessary to observe the distinction, which we see the Holy Ghost hath so precisely observed.

P. 505. "Theophylact saith the same that Beza said out of Chrysostom and Ecumenius. The Greek liturgies, falsely intituled to St James Basil and Chrysostom, have no other thing, nor any author that you name. But your Popish church does not as either of the Greek liturgies, or as the churches in Ambrose's or Augustine's time. For they hold that the elements are consecrated by prayer and thanksgiving; whereof, although you use some terms in your mass, yet you hold that the consecration consisteth in a magical murmuration of the words *Hoc est corpus Meum* over the bread by a priest with intent of consecration. Wherefore you are far from the judgment that the ancient fathers had, and we have, of the consecration of the bread and wine, &c.

On John xx. "It can never be proved that Christ's body came either through the wood of the doors or through the stone of the sepulchre, &c. Neither is it said Christ came through the doors being shut, but after the doors were shut; which yet at His entry were opened miraculously as to the apostles the prison doors, Acts v. 19 and xii. 10. You say that some say He came in at the

window, yet are you able to name none of us that so saith or thinketh.... Where have you any express Scripture that He came through the wood of the doors being shut? The express words of St John are "after the doors had been shut."... Admitting that He came in miraculously, your gross imagination is contrary to the doctrine and argument of Christ Himself, when, to remove that false suspicion out of their minds He saith, Handle and see Me, for a spirit, &c., &c.

(GG.) THEODORE BEZA. B. 1519. D. 1605.

We get the best idea of Beza's position by drawing it out parallel with Calvin's. His birth was ten years after Calvin's: but he lived forty-one after Calvin's death in 1564. Calvin became Professor of Theology in Geneva in 1536: but Beza succeeded him five years before he died, *i.e.* in 1559. Thus he returned to France in two years, and led the Protestants in the conference at Poissy, and remained a year, and was in the battle at Dreux with the Prince of Condé: but in the next year 1563 he returned to Geneva and took Calvin's place as the head of the Calvinists on Calvin's death in the year after. This function he discharged for the long period of 41 years. When we take into consideration that he was of a noble family and had been reckoned an excellent poet, and like Clement Marot, the French hymn-writer, had in the early part of his life struck his lyre to unhallowed as well as courtly themes, and been Prior of Langameaux, one can imagine how his long continuance at the helm of the vessel of Gospel truth among the speakers of the French language wore out the patience of the Jesuits. They indeed made him out to be dead six years before the time; to which he pleasantly replied in a tract, *Beza Redivivus* or come to life again. In 1571 he presided at a synod held at Rochelle. He finished Marot's half-achieved translation of the Psalms, and he translated the Song of Solomon. Stephens published Beza's *Poemata varia*; many of which had twice been put forth as *Juvenilia Bezae*. In a word, if in tone of doctrine and ripeness of judgment he followed Calvin, he adorned it with something of the elegant scholarship of Erasmus. His edition of the Greek Testament is perhaps his greatest literary work. Our extracts reveal its character, and as he wrote much beside, it is no wonder that his numerous followers in Switzerland and France as

well as his admirers in other lands styled him the Phoenix of his age. His frequent prominence in colloquies, his capacity of sustaining Protestant interests with the great, and the utility of his scholarship in laying the foundations for a received text of the New Testament, go far to justify the above title. He has nevertheless, but with less fitness, been termed the Melanchthon of Calvin.

He was born at Vezelay from a noble stock on both sides, and in the midst of the richest preferments he decided after a severe conflict to give up all for Christ and godliness: and never had he cause to doubt God's overruling care and love. He honoured God and God honoured him. He went on bearing more fruit as years increased, until his life's sun set in hope and glory.

John vi. 62. "If that now offend you which I have now said concerning the eating of My flesh, which ye have present in the earth, how much more will it seem to you incredible when it shall be absent from you, having been received into the heavens? And yet without the receiving of this flesh eternal life cannot be the lot of anyone. And from this it follows that we must not establish either such a presence or such an eating as is repugnant to the truth of the body itself.... By His own ascension predicting the truth of the taking away of His own humanity from the earth to the heavens. V. 63, Know ye therefore that I have spoken not of the bodily mode of eating and drinking... but by transference (of ideas) of the spiritual perception (reception or discernment) of Myself, which is not performed by the teeth but by the mind, and which looks to that life which is spiritual and eternal... (which is used) generally of any natural use of food... not even excepting (from the use of the term) even His own flesh, eaten in such a way as the people [in the synagogue] at Capernaum dreamed:

*Theodorus Beza, Nov. Test. John VI. 62.*

Si nunc vos offendit quod dixi de carnis Mæ, quam in terris præsentem habetis, esu, quanto magis id videbitur vobis incredibile, cum a vobis aberit, in cælum recepta? Et tamen extra hujus carnis perceptionem vita æterna non potest cuique contingere. Unde consequitur talem neque præsentiam neque manducationem carnis statuendam, quæ ipsius corporis...veritati repugnet...Sue humanitatis e terris in cælos ablationem veram ascensu Suo prædicens. V. 63, Scitote igitur me non de corporali edendi vel bibendi modo...sed de Mei spirituali perceptione, quæ non dente sed mente peragitur, et ad vitam illam spiritualem et æternam spectat, translatitiæ esse locutum...generaliter de omni naturali cibi usu...ne carnem quidem Suam excipiens, sic comesam ut Capernaïtæ



between whom certainly, and our transubstantiators or consubstantiators, there is not even ever so little difference, with whatever paint they hide the dogma concerning the real essence of Christ's flesh, (taken on their theory) in common by the worthy and unworthy. It is not therefore contrary to this that 'the flesh 'profiteth nothing,' namely unto eternal life, and to what Christ had before said of His own flesh, 'that the eating of His flesh was 'life giving and the drinking of His blood,' since Christ teaches that in the former sentence 'eating' and 'drinking' are spoken in their proper (own) sense indeed, but in the latter by transference (of ideas), and that they are in this place by transference applied to the action of the mind and of faith: and in this latter sense He had called Himself 'living bread' in opposition to the manna ... Finally they seem to me to be in a kind of hallucination who think that Christ here spoke properly and *specifically* concerning the sacramental eating of His own flesh and the drinking of His own blood—as well as those who so pertinaciously contend that those things do not at all belong to the Lord's supper... But those (other) admit three very shameful errors: one, that they substitute with the Capernaïtes a bodily eating for a mental and spiritual one to be performed by faith: another, that they prostitute Christ's flesh in making it to be eaten by any persons whatever, ever so unworthily receiving it: thirdly, that in the case of unworthy receivers they not only draw a distinction between Christ's benefits and His own flesh, and between His own flesh and His benefits, but they even in actual fact disjoin them ... Luke xxii. 20. This cup, which is in process of being

---

somniabant: a quibus certe ne tantillum quidem distant neque μετανοῦσαι neque συννοῦσαι, quocunque tandem fuco de Ipsius Christi carnis essentiâ reali, &c., tum dignis tum indignis communi, dogma operiant. Non pugnat igitur "Carnem nihil prodesse," nempe ad vitam æternam tribuendam, et, quod antea de Suâ carne Christus dixerat, "vivificum esse Sux carnis esum et Sui sanguinis potum," cum "esum" et "potum" in illâ quidem sententiâ proprie, in istâ vero translatitiæ dici, et ad mentis fideique actionem translatitiæ applicari doceat hoc loco Christus: quo etiam sensu Sese "panem vivum" vocârat manhæ oppositum... Denique hallucinari quoque mihi videntur qui Christum proprie et specialiter hic esse de sacramentali Sux carnis esu et Sui sanguinis potu locutum sentiunt, tum qui nihil ista ad cœnam Domini pertinere tam pertinaciter contendunt. Isti vero... tres maxime pudendos errores admittunt... unum, quod cum Capernaitis corporeum esum pro mentali sive spirituali per fidem peragendo substituant: alterum quod quibusvis quantumlibet indigne accipientibus Christi carnem prostituunt: tertium, quod in indigne accedentibus tum Christi beneficia ab Ipsius carne, tum Ipsius carnem ab Ejus beneficiis, non tantum distinguunt sed etiam re ipsâ disjungunt... Luke xxii. 20, Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυρό-

poured out for you. ... The apparent solecism is plain, since grammatically it would be said with the participle in the dative to agree with the words 'My blood,' as Basil reads the passage in his Ethics, Determination 21: or rather, as this had been noted in the margin from Matthew and Mark, it afterwards crept into the text: which is the more easy to admit because, since in the verse before, had been written 'My body which is given for you' (in the nominative), it seemed that something similar was to be added here where He treats of the blood. But no such addition is made 1 Cor. xi. ... It has by no means escaped me that it is yet so read in the Syrian translation and in all the Greek manuscripts that I have looked into.

Matt. xxvi. 26. "Therefore δειπνον in this history is the (Paschal) supper according to the law, to abrogate which the Lord afterwards substituted for it till the end of time His own, 'the Lord's supper.'... This however is certain, that the ceremony, which is by God's precept performed in the use of the sacraments, was ratified in heaven: and that thenceforward bread and wine in that sacred action are in quality changed [This is a step beyond not Calvin only, but even Luther], since they are made true symbols of the Lord's body and blood—a thing which they obtain not either of their own nature or by the virtue of certain set pronounced words but by the appointment of the Son of God... 'Is,' by metonymy; yet in such a way that we know that besides the sign that thing is truly received by them that believe (by faith [and] in a spiritual manner) which is represented by the outward sign, (though it is) to be held forth to faith and taken (by faith):

μενον... Manifestum est solœcophanes, cum dicendum fuerit (grammaticæ) τῷ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνομένῳ ut legit Basilius in Ethicis δρῶ κα': aut potius, cum hæc essent ad marginem annotata ex Matthæo et Marco, postea in contextum irrepserunt. Quod eo quidem facilius est admissum, quod cum in superiore versiculo adscriptum esset τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον (σῶμα)... simile quippiam visum fuit adjiciendum ubi agitur de sanguine. Sed hoc non additur 1 Cor. xi.... Quia tamen hoc etiam legitur apud Syrum interpretem et in omnibus quos inspeximus Græcis codicibus minime prætermisi.

#### Matt. XXVI. 26.

Itaque δειπνον in hac historia cœna legalis; quam abrogans postea Dominus suum, τὸ Κυριακὸν δειπνον, ei ad fines usque sæculorum substituit.... Hoc tamen certum est ratam esse in cœlo ceremoniam, quæ ex Dei præcepto in sacramentorum usu peragitur, ac proinde panem et vinum in sacrâ illâ actione *qualitate* mutari, cum fiant corporis et sanguinis Domini *vera* symbola, quod neque ex sui naturâ neque ex virtute certarum vocum pronunciatarum habent, sed ex Filii Dei institutione.... "Est," metonymice; ita tamen ut sciamus, *præter signum*, a credentibus *vere percipi* (per fidem spirituali modo) id, quod externo symbolo, fidei præbendum et sumendum, representatur, *totum* videlicet

that is to say a whole Christ with His own gifts for salvation. [How inconsistent with the first extract from Beza! It seems not like the same man. He must have been different at different times.] Yet neither transubstantiation nor what they call real conjunction or transfusion or commixture are to be thought of, but the relative or sacramental conjunction of the sign and the thing. For neither can they be consistent with the truth of Christ's humanity, nor are they necessary to salvation. [One can only compare Beza's explanation to a piece of patchwork made with opposite colours.] For neither must Christ's body be really present upon earth, in order that we may be partakers of Christ; but rather by the virtue of the Holy Spirit and by faith we must ascend (to Him) to Heaven, [Then it must be all metaphorical; and no *change* of the body of Christ *in quality* is at all required, in order that we may *by faith* be united to it], and there embrace Him that we may sit with Him in Heavenly places [and this not with our bodies nor by changing the locality of our souls, but simply in thought and faith that sees the unseen]. The sum of all is, it is necessary to salvation that we be truly conjoined and become one (body) with the whole Christ, God and man; and this does not take place in any but a spiritual mode, by faith. But this faith is created and confirmed in us by the Holy Spirit; and that, by the preaching of the word of God, by signs joined to preaching, by which all our senses are excited and driven on that we may truly strive forth after the possession of Christ Himself."

Besides this strange medley—strange to come from Beza—I am obliged to stop short in a previous quotation by the stranger slip, that Christ's body was "then" (at that time), when Christ spoke in Capernaum, "in the heavens." I can only suppose that this singular saying was put out to explain a phrase only difficult in appearance, "the Son of man Who is in heaven."

---

*Christum*, cum Suis ad salutem donis. Neque tamen vel transubstantiatio, vel realis (quam vocant) conjunctio, vel transfusio aut commistio, cogitandæ; sed signi et rei *conjunctio* *σχετικῇ* aut sacramentalis. Nam illa neque consistere possunt cum veritate humanitatis Christi, neque ad salutem sunt necessaria, neque enim, ut Christi participes fiamus, Ejus corpus oportet *realiter in terris adesse*, sed nos potius Spiritus sancti virtute et fide in cælum ascendere et illic Eum amplecti, ut cum Eo consideremus in cœlestibus. In summâ, vere nos conjungi et unum fieri cum toto Christo, Deo et homine, necesse est, ut salvi fiamus; quod non alio quam spiritali modo fit per fidem. Hæc autem fides in nobis creatur et confirmatur per Spiritum sanctum; idque prædicatione verbi Dei, et adjunctis prædicationi symbolis; quibus omnes nostri sensus excitantur et percelluntur, ut vere nitamur in Christi Ipsius possessionem.

(HH.) MARTIN CHEMNITZ. B. 1522. D. 1577.

He fully merits the title of the Melanchthon of Saxony. His *Loci Theologici* answer to those of Melanchthon and to the *Loci Communes* of Peter Martyr. The title-page of my edition says that they correspond, and comments upon the *Loci Communes* of Melanchthon. It also contains a treatise regarding the Presence of Christ in the Lord's supper, and another on the two natures. His great work is said to be his *Examen Concilii Tridentini*, and he published a work confuting the doctrines of the Jesuits. He comes to notice as the leader of the Saxon divines in making a supplementary confession to those of Melanchthon and Luther. The Confession of Augsburg was the great German Charter of Protestant nobles of Germany; who then, 1530, took that title and adopted that Confession at Melanchthon's hand, Luther co-operating by letter from his quiet retreat. When Rome put forth her *Confutatio*, Melanchthon put forth his "Apology," and in 1536 Luther added the Articles of Schmalkald. These together with Luther's two catechisms were the received formularies of the German Protestant faith. But in 1577 Andrew Jacob, Chancellor of Wirtemberg, in conjunction with Chemnitz, Andrew Musculus, and other Saxon divines, added the *Formula Concordiæ* based upon the Articles (96 n.) agreed on at Torgau the year before. All the four before-mentioned formularies were collected into the *Liber Concordiæ* in 1580, which was subscribed by the clergy "as solemnly as Scripture itself." See Hagenbach's *History of Doctrines*. He was born at Britzen in Magdeburg. He was made Superintendent of the Church of Brunswick, and Mosheim praises his work on the Council of Trent, next after and in like language with that of the Centuriators of Magdeburg, a great work now somewhat superseded by the greater facility of collecting a complete series of the fathers as far at least as Migne goes, and with the exception of some very important writers whom the Roman church excludes as unorthodox. Chemnitz also commenced a harmony of the Gospels, which was completed by John Gerhard. The first passage cited from him seems to me to have no small weight in the six parts of the seven that are against our adversaries: as to the one part in seven that is directed against us we

can only say, and quite willingly, we wish it to be fairly considered.

P. 185, *On the two natures in Christ*. "But He has removed into heaven from us who are on earth that mode of visible conversation and that circumscribed and local form of the presence of His own body according to the conditions and manner of living in this age according to the flesh; and this is what He said, 'Again I leave the world.'

P. 188. "Christ (although He has ordinarily taken away from the earth the natural mode of the presence of His own body, and is about to appear in the judgment in glory can yet be present on the earth in His own body (even after His ascension and before the judgment) or can exhibit a presence of His own body on the earth whenever however and wherever He will, even in a visible form... But Christ mentions His own body and blood; not that He would have it understood that His own body is present in the supper, either torn away from His blood or both of them separated from the soul and outside the hypostatic union with the Godhead apart and separated as it were 'in the abstract.'... Those who were acknowledging Him to be true God Himself could not doubt upon the presence of His Godhead in the church, since that (Divine) essence of His, as being in the propriety of its nature infinite and immense, fills heaven and earth... But they could doubt regarding the presence of His own humanity after His own departure out of this world because they knew that by the pro-

*De duabus naturis in Christo, c. XXX., p. 185. Wittenberg, 1615.*

Illum vero modum visibilis conversationis ac illam *circumscriptam* ac localem *formam præsentiæ* Sui corporis, juxta conditiones et *rationem vivendi* hujus sæculi *secundum carnem*, a nobis qui in terris sumus in cælum subduxit; et hoc est quod dixit "Iterum relinquo mundum."

P. 188.

Christum (licet naturalem modum præsentiæ corporis Sui *ordinarie* terris abstulerit, ac in gloriâ in judicio demum appariturus sit) tamen Suo corpore (etiam post ascensionem et ante judicium) presentem adesse aut præsentiâ corporis Sui exhibere posse in terris quancumque ubicumque et quomocumque vult, etiam in visibili formâ (as to Paul more than once)...Nominat autem Christus corpus Suum et sanguinem *non quod* corpus Suum vel a sanguine avulsum vel utrumque ab animâ separatum et *extra* hypostaticam cum Divinitate unionem seorsim et separatim quasi in abstracto, *in cœnâ adesse* intelligi voluit...De Divinitatis Suae præsentiâ in ecclesiâ (quoniam illa essentia Sua ut proprietate naturæ infinitâ et immensâ cælum et terram implet) dubitare non poterant illi qui verum Deum Ipsum esse agnoscebant...De humanitatis vero Suae præsentiâ post abitum Suum ex hoc mundo, quia illam *proprietary*

priety of its nature it is finite, and they had hitherto seen Him present by a local and visible circumscription, &c. Therefore He expressly names His own body and blood, in order to shew that by this naming of those things in which His human nature consists, He describes indicates promises sanctions and confirms fully expressly clearly and manifestly against all sophistical deceits the presence of His whole person in the church on earth not according to His Godhead only but also according to His own assumed human nature. For He wished the action of the supper to be a pledge seal and signing of His presence as with a seal [on the face of a deed]. But because there is a great sharp and vehement controversy on this question, that the explanation may thereby be rendered plainer and more ready, we will first remove those things which on both sides are rejected [he means among reasonable persons—only that would be too sharp and sweeping for him to say] and which cannot hold together [or consistently exist] that the controversy may be so brought down to its true state.

“(1) Because the supper of the Lord is not celebrated in a church among the stars nor in the sky but in this earth in various and many different and innumerable places, we say that there is not any physical property or essential peculiarity in the body of Christ, so that it can be by itself or of itself at the same place and at one time by its own substance in divers places. Yea we add that this is contrary to the reason of common form, or contrary to physical reason, yea contrary to the nature of bodies, which have been constituted of a certain finite and circumscribed dimension of their members. For nature extends not itself to those things which

*naturæ finitam* esse sciebant, ac circumscriptione locali et visibili hactenus Illud presentem viderant, dubitare poterant, &c. Ideo expresse corpus Suum et sanguinem nominat, ut hac nominatione eorum, quibus humana natura constat, totius Personæ Suæ, non secundum Divinitatem tantum, verum etiam secundum assumptam humanam Suam naturam, *præsentiam in ecclesia in terris* diserte expresse clare ac manifeste *contra omnes sophisticas elusiones* Se describere indicare promittere sancire et confirmare ostenderet. Ejus enim præsentiae pignus sigillum et obsignationem *actionem cœnæ* esse voluit...Quia vero magna acris et vehemens est de hac quæstione controversia, ut explicatio eo reddatur planior expeditior, *removebimus primum ea*, quæ utrinque rejiciuntur et *quæ consistere non possunt*, ut ita ad verum statum controversia deducatur.

(1) Quia cœna Dominica non inter sidera aut in cœlo sed in his terris in variis diversis multis et innumerabilibus locis in ecclesiâ celebratur, dicimus *non esse* physicam proprietatem aut essentielle idioma corporis Christi, ut per se aut ex se simul ac semel substantiâ suâ sit in pluribus diversis locis. Imo addimus hoc esse contra rationem formæ communis, vel contra rationem physicam, imo contra naturam corporum, quæ certâ finitâ et circumscriptâ dimensione membrorum constant. Natura enim non se extendit ad ea quæ transcendunt ordinem natura-

go beyond natural order, as the scholastic writers say. We grant therefore that according to the natural properties of a true body and by any essential peculiarity of Christ's body (which by a property of its nature is limited) that it is not present in the supper in all places. (2) And we say that neither by any remarkable putting forth of it, nor by any such presence as is according to the plan and condition of glorified bodies, is this presence of Christ's body established in the supper, &c. For it is in this way that Christ appears in His own body to the blessed in heaven. And He will not before the last judgment appear on earth, according to the ordinary dispensation of things, in that form (*i.e.* the glorified form) or in anything near that form. (3) We in no wise teach that Christ's body is like an immense mass expanded distributed diffused drawn asunder or extended through all places; or as Damascene says that the flesh of Christ is 'together extended 'by the side of all things,' bodily coextended with the Deity which takes it to Him, so that it is in this way present (already) in all places where the Lord's supper is (celebrated). (4) Nor do we say that Christ's body is present in the supper by any multiplying or repeating, as the image of one body appears in many divers pieces of a broken looking-glass. Christ is speaking in the words of institution of His own body and blood themselves not of a reflexion or an image. And Christ's body is one not many, &c. (5) By no means do we think that Christ's body (either in union or in glory) has lost its own substance and had its own essential properties abolished and been turned or transmuted into a substance which is spiritual measureless infinite, &c. (6) Nor can it

---

lem, ut scholastici dicunt. *Concedimus igitur non juxta naturales proprietates veri corporis nec per essenziale aliquod idioma corpus Christi, (quod naturæ suæ proprietate finitur) in omnibus locis in cenâ adesse, &c.,* (2) *nec conspicuâ aliquâ exhibitione aut tali præsentia, qualis est ratio et conditio corporum glorificatorum, præsentiam hanc corporis Christi in cenâ constare dicimus, &c.* Hoc enim modo beatis in cælo Christus corpore Suo jam apparet: de *ordinariâ dispensatione* in illâ formâ et juxta illam formam ante extremum judicium in terrâ *non apparebit.* (3) Nequaquam docemus corpus Christi tanquam immensam molem per omnia loca expansam [which Leibnitz in his day contended for] diductam diffusam distractam vel extensam; vel, sicut Damascenus loquitur, carnem Christi *συνταραπεκτινομένη* corporaliter coextensam cum Deitate assumente, ut hoc modo in omnibus locis, ubi cæna Domini celebratur, adsit. (4) Nec dicimus corpus Christi per multiplicationem aut replicationem, sicut unius corporis imago in pluribus diversis fracti speculi partibus apparet, in cenâ adesse. De ipso corpore et sanguine Suo Christus in verbis institutionis non de idolo aut imagine Ejus loquitur. Et unum est corpus Christi, non multa, &c. (5) Nullo etiam modo sentimus corpus Christi (vel in unione vel in gloriâ) amissâ Suâ substantiâ et abolitis essentialibus suis proprietatibus *conversum* aut transmutatum esse in *substantiam spiritualem* infinitam immensam,

be established [or exist] that the Divine nature alone is to be understood to be present and not the human also, when Christ names His own body [This is just Luther's argument at Marburg, Part III. of this book. Christ *said*, This is My body. That is enough] and blood. [Thus the Lutherans take the very responsible task of closing as far as in them lies the only road of escape from the assumed literal sense of Christ's words, which stands on nothing beyond an arbitrary interpretation; in fact the point is as to *mere rendering an open question*, to be settled by considerations of custom in writing and consequences in actual history and in philosophy.]... For God is a Spirit Who has not flesh and bones, which belong to the substance of human nature. (7) Nor does it agree to the words of the institution if we wish to understand a presence of Christ's body in the supper to be of merit only or virtue or efficacy (His substance being excluded or separated): for He says, This is My body, &c., &c. These (seven) things having been cast away,...[Chemnitz as a follower of Luther says that] Christ that is to say with His own body and blood... determines to be there present, and by His own humanity which He assumed, as by an instrument akin to us, as the ancients say, determines to apply His own benefit to us [for this natural presence is required], to confirm, to seal, and so to effect in the church the office of vivifying according to both our natures [*i.e.* in our bodies and souls] by His own vivifying flesh. [Cyril of Alexandria dwelt on this doctrine of Christ's flesh teeming with life for our bodies and our souls.]... We may desire to remove this salutary presence of Christ. The reasons (for this) out of the word of God must certainly be the clearest the most firm the most certain and the most urgent, &c., &c. [Is it not enough if we destroy his application of Ephes. v. just cited as nihil ad rem and so of his other passages to be cited? and then, as Chemnitz has no clarissimæ firmissimæ rationes ex verbo Dei, our arguments from Scripture, science and history may be considered as in Part III. of this work.]

&c. &c. (6) Nec etiam constare potest Divinam naturam *solum præsentem* et non etiam humanam intelligendam quando *Christus nominat corpus Suum* et sanguinem. Deus enim est spiritus, qui carnem et ossa non habet, quæ ad humanæ naturæ substantiam pertinent. (7) Nec verbis institutionis convenit, si *præsentiam solius meriti, virtutis* seu *efficaciæ* corporis Christi (exclusâ seu separatâ ejus substantiâ) in cœnâ intelligere volumus. Dicit enim, &c. &c. Hisce...abjectis...Christum scilicet corpore et sanguine Suo...velle præsentem adesse, ac per assumptionem Suam humanitatem, *tanquam per organon* nobis cognatum, sicut veteres loquuntur, velle nobis beneficia Sua *applicare* confirmare obsequare, atque *ita* officium *vivificationis* secundum utramque naturam per *carnem* Suam *vivificantem* in ecclesiâ efficere...Hanc salutarem præsentiam Christi...removere velimus; oportet sane rationes ex verbo Dei clarissimas firmissimas certissimas et urgentissimas esse, &c. &c.... Jam



... Now therefore this is the point that is being debated in this controversy, whether we are to embrace that simple proper and natural sentence of the words of the Son of God, or whether we must truly depart from the simplicity and propriety of the words, &c., the native sentence must be rejected and another interpretation thought out for ourselves, from the workshop of metaphors.

P. 103. "There is no end of the Divine power. Beyond peculiar properties (of His body) that it is present simply by Divine power in many places (at once). We trust Divine matters to God (alone).

P. 167. *On the Lord's Supper.* "Since He in flowing words has promised the presence of His body and blood in the supper in the very words of His own testament, therefore let us believe simply and without any speaking against them, even if such a presence seem to be at war with the natural properties of our physical bodies." [This at least is speaking outright: but all because Chemnitz and so many divines have resolved within themselves that the words will not, shall not, and did not bear a figurative sense.]

in totâ hac controversiâ illud igitur, an simplex propria et natura illa verborum Filii Dei sententia amplectenda, &c., an vero a simplicitate et proprietate verborum, &c., discedendum, nativa ejus sententia rejicienda et ex troporum officinâ alia interpretatio excogitanda sibi.

P. 103.

Potentia Divina non est finis. Supra idiomata per voluntatem Dei in pluribus locis adesse. Credimus Deo Divina.

*De cœna Domini, p. 167.*

Cum præsentiam corporis et sanguinis sui in cœnâ ipsis verbis Testamenti Sui diserte pollicitus est, ideo nos eam simpliciter et absque omni contradictione credamus, etiamsi cum naturalibus proprietatibus physici corporis talis præsentia pugnare videatur.

(II.) CARDINAL THOMAS DE VIO.

CAIETANUS (Cajetan or Gaetan). D. 1534.

"Tu quoque littoribus nostris Æneïa nutrix  
Æternam moriens famam, Caieta, dedisti."

This distich has a particular charm to anyone who coming from Florence has stood on high ground and overlooked the bay and mole of Gaieta in a landscape of a different kind but scarcely less beautiful than the Bay of Naples from the height to the north that bears the name of Virgil's tomb. We have here a new link of

connexion with that place. In the prefatory letter addressed to Clement VII. the cardinal says that after his work on the Psalms he complied with the requests of many in taking the New Testament in hand. He says he led a retired life at Gaieta for 27 months for that purpose. In this time he finished his comments on the historical part of the New Testament: but he originally intended only to expound the literal sense: he says nothing can be of use that does not square with the doctrine of the apostolic seat; he submits all to the judgment of His Apostleship: and he only hopes that the work will compensate for his own prolonged absence at Gaieta. It is subscribed at the close, At Gaieta on the sacred day of St Peter and St Paul, 1529. It was inspected and recognized by John Daniel, S.D.N., and passed the press May, 1536. There are other Cajetans, notably two; James, also a cardinal, and Benedict, Pope Benedict VIII. Thomas of Gaieta also wrote a comment on Aquinas, unless this be his "Summa." But he is chiefly notable for his connexion with Luther, according to the letter of Pope Leo X., which commanded him to use "the arm of" "our son the well-beloved in Christ Maximilian Emperor of the Romans to make Luther appear before him," to get him into his power and then await further orders from Rome. But he is allowed, if Luther shall of his own accord come and ask pardon for his temerity and return to himself and shew signs of penitence, in that case to receive Luther handsomely (benigne), Gieseler, v. 237. This was in 1518. The issue is history: but this Cajetan is our commentator on the Gospels and the Acts. He also wrote on the pope's side against the Council of Pisa and against the doctrine of the supremacy of General Councils maintained by Dalmaine, D'Ailly, Gerson and the Sorbonne in general at that time. His name by baptism was James. He took the name Thomas on entering a Dominican convent. The Duke of Milan when he met him expressed his astonishment at seeing a man so little of stature and of so dark a complexion; but Cajetan replied, God Himself made us and not we ourselves, "*Ipse fecit nos, non nos ipsi.*" In 1527 when Constable Bourbon attacked Rome, Cajetan was taken and ransomed himself by paying 5000 pieces of gold. As he was escorted by a brutal crowd of soldiers to the castle of St Angelo, the pope looked out on the peril of the aged cardinal and cried out, Have a care how you put out the church's light. An Italian calls him "the second Thomas," after Aquinas.

Commentary, John vi. 23. "Unless ye eat the flesh, &c., &c." "This text is similar to the command of baptism, 'Unless a man 'be born again,' &c. (chap. iii.) since it is said of a thing of equal necessity and like manner. It has been and is an occasion of divers factions or sects. It must then be the more discerningly discussed... The sense then is threefold. The first concerning faith in Christ's death, &c. The second, concerning faith in the sacrament of the eucharist, which is a memorial of Christ's death. For the cup and the host separately signify the reality of the flesh and blood, which was on the cross. And this is the sense, Unless ye shall spiritually have eaten and drunken the sacrament of the eucharist ye have not life in you. And this sense is the true, since spiritually to eat and drink the sacrament of the eucharist, as relating to the (inward) thing in the eucharist, is no other than to abide in Christ and Christ to abide in him (the spiritual receiver). And it is plain that without such abiding there is no life of the Spirit, &c. It is not formal teaching regarding the (external) sacrament, but regarding the thing (itself) of the sacrament—but regarding the fount of the sacrament... The command of the sacrament drives (us) to the spiritual receiving, which stands in the (heart's) wish, as to the (very) beginning of the sacrament. The third sense therefore is concerning sacramental eating: yet (I mean) worthily. And the sense is, Unless ye shall *really* have eaten the flesh of the Son of man in the sacrament of the host, and shall have drunk His blood in the sacrament of the cup, ye have not the Spirit's life in you. [The first and second are Protestant and Scriptural senses: the third fully maintains the

---

*Commentary on the Gospels and the Acts, p. 205. John VI. 23, "Unless ye eat, &c."* Paris, 1536.

Textus iste similis præcepto baptismi, Unless a man be born, &c. c. iii. Pari siquidem necessitate et modo dicitur. Occasio diversum factionum seu sectarum fuit, et est. Ideo perspicacius discutiendus est .. Triplex igitur sensus. Primus de fide mortis Christi, &c. Secundus de fide sacramenti eucharistiæ, quod est *memoriale* mortis Christi. Calix enim et hostia separatim realitatem carnis et sanguinis quæ fuit in cruce significat. Et est sensus, Nisi spiritualiter manducaveritis et biberitis sacramentum eucharistiæ non habetis vitam in vobis. Et hic sensus est verus, quoniam spiritualiter manducare et bibere sacramentum eucharistiæ, quoad *rem sacramenti*, nihil aliud est quam manere in Christo et Christum manere in eo. Sine quâ mansionem constat non esse vitam Spiritûs...Sermo formalis non est de sacramento sed de re sacramenti, sed de fonte sacramenti...ad spiritualem perceptionem, quæ consistit in voto, cogit (præceptum sacramenti) tanquam ad initium sacramenti. Tertius itaque sensus est de manducatione sacramentali, digne tamen. Et est sensus, nisi *realiter* manducaveritis carnem Filii hominis in sacramento hostiæ et biberitis in sacramento calicis Fjus sanguinem, non habetis vitam Spiritus in vobis. Ita quod, juxta hunc sensum,

old and corrupt literal view.] So that according to this sense not only is the sacrament of baptism necessary unto salvation, but also the sacrament of the eucharist in both kinds. From this sense there rose up a little while ago the sect of the Bohemians giving the communion even to infants in both kinds. The custom of the church is adverse to this sense; for it is that infants are not to have the communion in both kinds nor the (adult) people. Nor is it a custom only, but a doctrine (too): since she teaches that it is sufficient for salvation to communicate in the kind of bread (only). And although this authority (of the church) suffices to manifest that the text itself does not entail the precept concerning the receiving of the sacrament under both kinds, and consequently does not deliver the precept concerning eating and drinking the sacrament of the eucharist, yet it is not enough to satisfy the followers of those doctrines; but they hold this text before them against our custom and doctrine, saying that unless the Lord was treating, in these words, of the receiving of the sacrament, He is making no distinction between eating and drinking; but that from His so accurately distinguishing between them, He suggests to us that He is treating of the reception of the sacrament of the eucharist... But these arguments are easily thrown aside by observing that a little above in this chapter Jesus said, 'He that cometh to Me shall never hunger.' For the Lord clearly distinguished in these words, which plainly have no reference to the sacrament of the eucharist, between hungering and thirsting, which is equivalent to distinguishing between eating and drinking. [A singular assumption of perfect exactitude throughout in the use of figurative language.]... But it is plain that the real

---

necessarium est ad salutem non solum sacramentum baptismi sed etiam sacramentum eucharistiæ sub utrâque specie. Hoc sensu orta paulo ante est secta Bohemorum communicantium etiam infantes sub utrâque specie. Huic sensui contrariatur ecclesiæ *consuetudo* non communicandos infantes nec populum sub utrâque specie. Nec sola consuetudo sed doctrina; quoniam docet sufficere ad salutem communicare sub specie panis. Et quamvis hæc autoritas sufficit ad manifestandum quod textus iste non trahit præceptum de perceptione sacramenti sub utrâque specie, et consequenter quod non tradit præceptum de manducando et bibendo sacramentum eucharistiæ, sectatoribus tamen illorum dogmatum non satis est, sed textum hunc pro se afferunt contra nostram consuetudinem et doctrinam, dicendo quod nisi de perceptione sacramenti tractaret Dominus in his verbis, non distinguit inter manducari et bibere; sed ex hoc quod tam accurate distinguit inter hæc, insinuat quod de perceptione sacramenti eucharistiæ tractat...sed hæc facile rejiciuntur perspicendo quod in hoc capitulo paulo superius Jesus dixit, He that cometh to Me shall never, &c. Clare enim in his verbis, quæ constat non spectare ad sacramentum eucharistiæ, Dominus distinguit esurire et sitire: quod sequè valet ac distinguere inter manducare et bibere...constat autem

separation of flesh and blood is in the sacrament only (said) representatively. [No reason given. A mere assertion.] But in Christ's death it was real... Infants, that as yet can only suck not eat, would be most unaptly included under this command (if it be granted for argument's sake and not conceded that Christ is speaking about the eating of the sacrament). His own death is the perfect aliment of the soul: for perfect aliment consists of food and drink... Matt. xxvi. 'Jesus took bread and blessed (it).' With a benediction of praise not a benediction of consecration. And this appears from not Luke only but Paul, 1 Cor. xi., having put instead of (the word) blessing (the word) giving thanks, which is a benediction of praise, before breaking it. 'Receive ye, &c.' not to infants... The church with a laudable aim for the sake of reverence, ordered not... unless fasting—that the eucharist may not be touched except by holy hands. [Then eating is unholy.] The disciples... received from Jesus not by the hand but towards the hand—but from the table, since many sat at so great a distance that there their hands could not be united to (could not touch) Christ's hands. 'For remission of sins:' for all sins, so that there was a sufficiency. But 'for many,' so far that the remission of sins was effected... Mark xiv. 'Unleavened.' It is of the plural number: for the unleavened loaves are meant, on which alone it was allowed to feed on the seven days of the passover. [Unhappily the loaves are masculine in Greek and Latin.] Luke xxii. 'Gave thanks.' What words He may have said we know not. He gave thanks for the ending of the old sacrifices. 'I say unto you I will not drink of this, &c.' He speaks correctly to the letter: that

---

quod realis separatio carnis et sanguinis in sacramento est representative tantum. In morte autem Christi fuit secundum rem... Infantes, qui adhuc manducare non possunt sed sugere, inepte concluduntur sub hoc præcepto (dato sed non concesso quod de sacramenti manducatione textus loquitur). Mors Sua est alimentum perfectum animæ: constat enim alimentum perfectum ex cibo et potu... Matt. xxvi. "Accipit "Jesus panem et benedixit." Benedictione laudis, non benedictione consecrationis; et patet ergo eo quod tam Lucas quam Paulus 1 Cor. xi. loco benedictionis posuit gratiarum actionem (quæ est benedictio laudis) ante fractionem. "Accipite, &c." non infantibus... Ecclesia laudabiliter pro reverentiâ non... nisi jejuna... ut non nisi sacris manibus tangatur eucharistia. Discipuli... acceperunt a Jesu non manu sed ad manum, sed ex mensâ quum sederunt multi in tantâ distantia, ut manus Jesu manibus eorum non possent jungi. "In remissionem peccatorum," pro omnibus quantum ad sufficientiam. Sed "pro multis," tantum quantum ad effectam remissionem peccatorum... Mark xiv. "Azyma" pluralis est numeri. Significauerunt enim panes azymi, quibus tantum vesci licebat septem diebus Paschæ. Luke xxii. "Gratias egit." Quæ verba dixerit nescimus. Pro terminatione veterum sacrificiorum gratias egit. "Dico vobis non bibam, &c." Ad literam dicit Se posthac non bibitu-

He Himself will not drink wine until the kingdom come in His resurrection. For after His resurrection He ate and drank with the apostles, as Peter says, Acts x. 41, 'Who ate with and drank 'with Him after He rose from the dead;' where mark that He does not say, as He had said concerning the passover, 'until it be 'fulfilled in the kingdom of God,' but 'until the kingdom of God 'come.' [Fulfilment was a proper term to be used regarding the transitory passover. The Lord's supper is an integral part of the service of the kingdom.]... 'And having taken the bread.' The sacrifices of the old law being ended, He instituted the sacrifice of the new law, not taking to Him a lamb, or any flesh whatever, but bread for the peculiar material of the eucharist. 'He 'gave thanks' for the beginning of the sacrifice of the new testament. And He says not 'will be given,' but 'is given;' which had begun to be given. Already He was sold. 'For you,' not for guilt of Mine but for your redemption. 'Do this.' He says not 'say this' but 'do,' because He commands that the things be done which He Himself did, that is, to take bread, to give thanks, to break, to consecrate, to take and give. 'For My remembrance.' For My passion, by which My body is given for you, will go to be a thing of the past: and on that account for a commemoration of Me to be in memory of so great a benefit which I confer on you, perform (do) this sacrifice. 'In like manner the cup also after He '(had) supped.' If this cup were not a different one from that which had been partaken of before (in the passover) Luke would not have said 'in like manner,' 'after:' as if it had openly said, He took the former cup in the supper; but He took this after He (had) supped. The other evangelists do not put 'the cup' among

---

rum vinum donec veniat regnum in Suâ resurrectione. Post resurrectionem enim manducavit et bibit cum apostolis, dicente Petro, "Qui manducavimus et bibimus cum Illo postquam resurrexit de mortuis," ubi nota quod non dicit (sicut dixerat de paschate) donec impleatur in regno Dei, sed donec veniat regnum Dei. "Et accepto pane." Finitis veteris legis sacrificiis, instituit sacrificium novæ legis, non assumens agnum aut carnes quascunque, sed panem pro propriâ eucharistiæ materiâ. "Gratias egit." Pro initio sacrificii novi testamenti. Et non dicit "Dabitur" sed "datur," quod inceptum erat dari. Jam venditus erat. "Pro vobis." Non pro Meâ culpâ, sed pro vestrâ redemptione. "Hoc facite," non dicit "Hoc dicite," sed "facite," quia mandat fieri quæ Ipse fecit, scilicet accipere panem, gratias agere, frangere, consecrare, sumere ac dare. "In Mei commemorationem." Passio enim Mea, quâ pro vobis corpus Meum datur, transibit in præteritum; et propterea in Mei commemorationem, in memoriam tanti beneficii quod vobis confero, facite hoc sacrificium. "Similiter et calicem postquam cœnavit." Si non alter esset calix iste a prius communicato, non dixisset Lucas "Similiter," "Postquam." Ac si aperte dixisset, Priorem calicem accepit cœnando, hunc autem accepit postquam cœnavit. Alii evangelistæ inter verba Christi non ponunt

Christ's words because they were intending to signify the virtue of Christ's blood shed on the cross in regard to the new covenant, 'The cup of the new covenant.' Since the cup of the eucharist comes from the new (covenant) and from the dispensation (arrangement) of the eternal inheritance confirmed by Christ's blood on the cross. The blood had begun to be shed, since the selling (of Him) had begun His own death which was to follow by the shedding of His blood. 'There was a strife among them.' They contend after the death of Jesus for the primacy. 'That ye 'may eat.' He means understanding by eating, and taking delight in Him by drinking. Spiritual things because He is of the heavenly country, as the multitude of sensible writers explain it, by 'table' He means the feast of eternal bliss. 'Going up where 'He was before.' Ye shall see the truth, that I came down from heaven, and to shew the truth of both His natures. For He was before according to His Divine nature in heaven, and He was going up according to His human nature. One and the same person with both natures."

---

calicem, quia intendebant significare virtutem sanguinis Christi effusi in cruce respectu N. T. "Calix N. T." Ex novo siquidem et æternæ hæreditatis dispositione Christi sanguine in cruce firmatâ poculum eucharistiæ provenit. Inceperat fundi sanguis, venditio siquidem inchoaverat. Ipsius mortem, sanguinis effusione sequuturam. "Contentio erat." Contendunt de primatu post mortem Jesu. "Ut edatis, &c." Intellectum significans per "edere", et delictatum per "bibere." Spiritualia quia cœlestis patriæ, sensibilium multitudine explicantium per "mensam" æternæ beatitudinis significat convivium, John vi. "Ascendentem ubi erat prius." Videbitis veritatem...quod descendi de cœlo...et propter veritatem utriusque naturæ. Erat enim prius secundum naturam Divinam in cœlo: et ascendebat secundum naturam humanam. Una et eadem hypostasis utriusque naturæ.

(JJ.) JOHN MALDONATUS. B. 1534. D. 1583.

He taught philosophy first in the University of Salamanca and afterwards was a very popular lecturer at Paris. He is notable chiefly for his commentary on the four Gospels, though he wrote also on the latter half of the Old Testament. He is reckoned after Erasmus and Cajetan among the commentators who gave the sense of Scripture in a less formal manner, and rescued readers from the fourfold treatment of every text, *i.e.* literally, allegorically, tropologically, and anagogically; the last word meaning the way of rising from the lower to the loftier senses of the passage: *i.e.*

sometimes to mysticism in its good sense of subjective religion, and sometimes in its bad sense of a dreaming religious fancy. Maldonat was promoted to Poitiers, and ended his days at Rome, whither he came on the pope's invitation respecting the intended new edition of the Greek LXX. His birthplace was Casas de la Reina in Estremadura in Spain. He studied at Salamanca and took up the pursuit of theology at Rome in his 28th year, and entered the order of the Jesuits, who sent him to teach at Paris, where they had only just obtained leave to appoint professors to represent them. His zeal and vivacity in polemics gained him the punning sobriquet of Maledicentissimus. He had to defend himself from the charge of heresy for maintaining that the immaculate conception was only a pious opinion and not a certain and unassailable doctrine, though it had been accepted by the Sorbonne. He had to retire to Bourges; where he worked at his edition of the Septuagint.

He left a large body of works, besides scholia and commentaries on several parts of Scripture, treatises on original sin, on grace, on the sacraments, and on angels and demons, also another on ceremonies; and it is supposed that more works lie hidden in the recesses of the Ambrosian library at Milan.

P. 124. "Of the eucharist. Question 4. On the absence or presence of the (inward) thing. Our opinion is that a sacrament's nature does not require the (inward) thing to be absent nor to be present, but only that the thing, which is not seen nor perceived by any other sense, be shewn to the mind. But we say, Christ's body is so present that it is not perceived by sense. Therefore it can be as properly and truly signified by an outward sign as if it were not there. The Holy Spirit was truly in the dove (and) yet the dove truly signifies the Holy Spirit [*i.e.* is a sign of Him—a neat reply to one kind of argument often adduced]. The Holy Spirit was truly present in the fiery tongues, &c.

*De Eucharistiâ. 4th Qn. de absentia aut presentia rei.* Lugduni, 1614.

P. 124.

Nostra sententia est naturam sacramenti non postulare ut res sit absens neque ut sit præsens, sed tantum ut res, quæ non videtur, neque alio sensu percipiatur, menti indicetur. Nos autem dicimus corpus Christi est præsens ita, ut non sensu percipiatur. Ergo tam proprie et vere per sacramentum externum significari potest quam si esset absens. Spiritus sanctus erat vere in columbâ, tamen columba vere significat Spiritum sanctum. Spiritus sanctus erat præsens in linguis ignitis, &c.



Therefore it is of no matter whether the thing in a sacrament be present or absent, so that itself though seen in signs is not perceived by the senses, &c. We then never say that there is a sacrament and a thing signified, &c. [as Bp. Cosin].

P. 128. "That there may be an analogy between Him and our nature which by Him (or by it) is nourished, &c., we say that our flesh is truly nourished by Christ's flesh but our soul by Christ's blood.

P. 322. "Beside these seven kinds of sacrifices our adversaries require that an eighth mode of sacrifices be allowed them, i.e. figuratively and by similitude... We make no difficulty of granting this. We ask them to grant another kind of sacrifice too, which has a little of commemoration in it, and partly true and real... For neither do we deny that there is a spiritual sacrifice in the first mode, nor that there is a sacrifice of praise in the second mode. But the state of the question is whether an improper sacrifice be in those eight modes only or no, but also whether there be not some other mode in which it is more properly and truly a sacrifice,—the thing which we affirm and they deny. [This is just the Romish last effort, a presence after a new and unexampled mode which is not the object of the senses.] When therefore we compare the eucharist with the sacrifice of Christ's body which was offered on the cross, we do not deny that this mode is of a lower kind than that most true sacrifice; if you look at all the points that usually are in a sacrifice. First the sacrifice and killing which was actually done on the cross, and in

Ergo nihil refert res sit præsens vel absens ut significata modo non sensibus percipiatur, &c. Nos nunquam dicere esse sacramentum et rem significatam.

P. 128.

Ut haberet analogiam cum naturâ nostrâ quæ Illo nutritur, &c., carnem nostram vere nutriri carne Christi; animam autem sanguine Christi...

P. 322.

Præter hæc (septem genera sacrificiorum) adversarii postulant sibi concedi octavum modum sacrificiorum figurate et per similitudinem... Hoc illis non gravate concedimus. Nos petimus ut etiam concedant aliud genus sacrificii, quod parum est commemorativum, partim verum et reale...neque enim negamus esse sacrificium spirituale primo modo, neque esse sacrificium laudis secundo modo, &c. &c. Sed status quæstionis est an non tantum octo illis modis improprium sacrificium sit, sed etiam aliquo alio modo magis proprie et vere id quod nos affirmamus: illi negant. Nos igitur cum comparamus eucharistiam cum sacrificio corporis Christi, quod in Cruce oblatum est, non negamus degenerare aliquo modo ab illo verissimo sacrificio, si spectentur omnia quæ in sacrificio esse solent...Primum mactatio et occisio, quæ in cruce reipsâ facta est,

the eucharist is only done by sharing and a sacred sign. (2) On the cross the form of Christ's body a visible sacrifice was offered up, in the eucharist an invisible. (3) On the cross a sacrifice was offered, which had in itself unto a sufficiency force to abolish the sins of all men, which could not... unless it were applied, which takes place in various modes—by faith, by love, by good works, and by an unbloody offering of the same body, also by receiving of it. We call that receiving a communicative sacrifice. Chrysostom, &c. [We demur to this.] But when they say this, they do not deny its being a true sacrifice. But when we shall compare... we say that the former was a sufficient sacrifice—the latter efficient and applicatory,—yet both propitiatory, not that that (unbloody oblation) is not a sacrifice. It is called sufficient and more than sufficient to apply to every man for whom the merit of that unbloody sacrifice is offered, &c. But we call both propitiatory because a proper sacrifice is no other thing than what has the power of appeasing God. But this power is in every victim, that by its own nature is pleasing to God, as is the body of Jesus Christ." [Admit then the real natural presence of Christ's body and you must concede all these points.]

---

in eucharistiâ non fit nisi communicatione et sacramento. (2) In cruce corporis Christi forma visibile oblatum est, in eucharistiâ invisibile. (3) In cruce oblatum est ad sufficientiam habens in seipso vim abolendi peccata omnium hominum, quod non... nisi applicaretur quod variis fit modis—per fidem,—per charitatem, per bona opera, et per oblationem incruentam Ejusdem corporis, item per sumptionem illius. Vocamus illam sacrificium communicativum, Chrysostom &c. Sed cum hoc dicunt, non negant esse verum sacrificium. Cum autem conferemus... dicimus illud fuisse sacrificium sufficiens—hoc efficiens et applicatorium—utrumque tamen propitiatorium non quod sacrificium ea non sit. Dicitur sufficiens et præter quam sufficiens applicet singulis hominibus pro quibus offertur meritum illius incruenti sacrificii, &c. Propitiatorium autem ideo dicimus utrumque, quia proprium sacrificium non est aliud quam habere vim placandi Deum. Hanc autem vim habet omnis victima quæ naturâ suâ grata est Deo, quale est corpus Christi.

(KK.) ROBERT BELLARMINE. B. 1542. D. 1621.

After the contemporary settlement of the doctrines of the Reformed Church of England and resettlement of those of the Roman communion in the Council of Trent's protracted sittings, the pope Pius IV. was authorized or some say was requested to provide a new redaction of the faith, called a catechism, for the parochial clergy. But the Jesuits, though not requested or authorized, took upon them the defence of the faith. Foremost of these beyond question stands Bellarmine, cardinal and archbishop. His

clear style, relieved by a bright imagination, must ever keep him popular. But besides this, he has the credit of being too fair to satisfy the violent on his own side. He did not deem heretics dogs not worthy of justice in argument and candour in statement. Nevertheless those who blamed him for toleration were weak in their intolerance. Bayle declared him the best controversialist of his age. His Ingolstadt three folios, *De Controversiis*, cast a shade over his commentaries on the Psalms, his sermons and his many treatises on many subjects which make up two more, five in all. But the Cologne Edition has the same in seven volumes. His birthplace, Monte Pulciano in Tuscany, is also famous for a wine of price. He became a Jesuit at 18 years of age, and was Cardinal and Archbishop of Capua, not far from the resting-place and study of Cajetan, in 1602.

In his 22nd year he taught rhetoric at Mondovi in a Jesuit college. In three years he went to Padua and Louvain, devoting his studies to theology. In his 28th year he was raised to a professorship, to do his utmost to stem the tide of the Reformation in the Low Countries. He stayed at Louvain seven years, and then was recalled to Rome. Sixtus V. employed him in revising the Vulgate. He went to help Cajetan in France in the conferences with the Huguenots in 1590. Henry III. had perished by the hand of Jacques Clement a year before; and efforts were being made to shut out Henry IV. from the throne. In 1592 Bellarmine became president of the Jesuits' College at Rome, and new honours distinguished him, up to the time of his crowning dignity at Capua, which however separated him from Rome. But under Paul V. he returned: and it is to his honour that when he left Capua he refused to be compensated by an annual pension laid on the revenues of the see. His last 15 years were devoted to his various works. He took part in vain resistance to the city of Venice under Father Paul, by which that city for ever broke the force of papal interdicts; which a Roman calls oddly "*anéantir les libertés de l'église.*"

John vi. 62. "On the truth of Christ's body. 'Doth this offend 'you?' One exposition, that the Lord wished to confirm the one

---

*De veritate Corp. Christi.* 4to. John VI. 62, "*Hoc vos scandalizat, &c.*"

Una Expositio, quod voluerit Dominus rem unam mirabilem aliâ

wonderful thing by another thing more or equally wonderful. ... Another that blames the incredulity of the disciples and teaches that they would have more occasion to doubt in the absence of Christ, if they doubt in His presence. How then will ye be able to believe the same thing, that Christ is exhibited (or supplied) to you present in the Lord's supper? But this exposition marvelously confirms the catholic truth. For if the Lord had only promised that they should receive His own body by faith, it would not have been more difficult to take it thus, but easier to those who had seen His resurrection. For the sight of the ascension strengthened the apostles in faith. [Granted; but what interpretation of this kind is to be compared with understanding Christ to ask the question, 'Will ye think of eating My natural body and drinking My natural blood when both have, by ascension to the Heaven from which I came, been very far removed from your touch or sight?'] Therefore Christ would not have said, 'What and if ye shall see? &c.' In that kind of thing, covenants or treaties, which are explained by the most exquisite words of their own, that no room may be left for cavils. An agreement (pact), *Exod. xxiv.* A covenant (testament), *Heb. ix.*

P. 478. "John vi. (1) Whether the Lord is speaking of the eucharist, (2) an argument drawn from it for the truth of the Lord, (3) the arguments of opponents to be answered, who think that the eucharist is not treated of in John vi. There is no controversy about the whole chapter being concerning the eucharist. There is only a question about those words 'The bread which I will give, &c.,' and nearly to the end of the chapter. Luther, On

---

mirabiliore vel æque mirabili confirmare... Altera quod reprehendat incredulitatem discipulorum ac doceat majorem occasionem eos habituros dubitandi in Christi absentia, si in Ejus presentia dubitant... Quomodo tunc poteritis credere idem, Christum vobis in eucharistia presentem exhiberi? Hæc autem expositio mirifice confirmat catholicam veritatem. Nam si Dominus solum promississet corpus Suum fide percipiendum, non fuisset difficilius sed facilius ita illud sumere, iis qui vidissent ascensionem Christi. Ascensio enim conspecta roboravit apostolos in fide. Non ergo Dominus diceret "Quid ergo si videritis, &c."... Pacta seu fœdera genere rerum, quæ exquisitissimis et propriis verbis explicantur, ne ullus locus relinquatur cavillis... Pactum, *Exod. xxiv.* Testam. *Heb. ix.*

*De Sac. Euch. Lib. I. 5, Vol. II. 478, De Joan. Ev. C. VI.*

*Op. Ingolstadt, 1691.*

1. An loquatur Dominus de Euch. 2. Argumentum inde pro veritate Domini. 3. Solvenda argumenta adversariorum qui putant Joan. vi. non agi de euch. Non est controversia an in toto capite agatur de euch.... solum quæstio est de illis verbis "Panis, quem Ego dabo, caro Mea est, &c." fere ad finem capituli... Lutherus De Capt. Bab.

the Captivity in Babylon, says that the whole chapter is to be set aside, as not at all belonging to this matter. Zwingel also, On False and True Religion, says the same, chap. on the eucharist [See extracts], and other divines. Peter Martyr most clearly expounded it against Gardiner, leaf 32, Objection. Spiritual eating the (inward) thing itself in the sacrament... that Christ has annexed outward signs; therefore we do not think that chapter foreign to the sacrament. (1) But if bread in that place signifies Christ, as He is received by faith without any reference to the appearances (kinds) of the sacrament, he would not say it in the future tense. Eating by faith is a thing of all times. And it is confirmed by the Greek text [being in the future] which heretics are wont to prefer to the Latin... The Lord therefore promised His flesh not absolutely, but to be received in the sacrament, and this promise He fulfilled in the last supper... This is confirmed, for He says concerning the Father, 'My Father gives.' The gift of His Son, *i.e.* His flesh was to be in the sacrament. (2) Comparison with the words of the supper. (3) 'How can this man, &c.' The Lord did not correct their meaning but inculcated it again, 'Except ye shall eat, &c.' Who would believe that the Lord wished to involve a most easy thing, such as it is to believe in Christ, in so many obscure metaphors with so much offence caused to the disciples, when He could with one word make the whole matter clear, &c.? [Christ had deeper aims which would not have been answered.] (4) The frequent distinction of flesh and blood and food and drink. (5) Comparison with the manna, &c. (6) The miracles of the loaves. (7) Amen. Amen. (8) Comparison with chap. iii. From the testimony of the church. From the fathers.

---

i. 6, dicit caput totum seponendum esse, ut quod nihil ad hanc rem pertineat. Idem Zuinglius De falsâ et verâ religione, cap. de Euch., et alii. Clarissime exposuit Peter Martyr con. Gard. ad fol. 32, Object. Res ipsa spiritualis manducatio... Christum adjunxisse symbola externa; idcirco nos caput illud a sacramento eucharistiæ non putamus esse alienum. 1. At si panis eo loco significat Christum ut fide percipitur sine ullâ relatione ad species sacramentales, non diceret in futuro. Manducatio per fidem res est omnium temporum. Et confirmatur ex textu Græco, quod hæretici Latino anteponebant solent... Promisit ergo Dominus carnem Suam non absolute, sed in sacramento sumendam, quod promissum implevit in ultimâ cœnâ... Confirmatur nam de Patre dicit, "Pater Meus dat." Donum Filii, *i.e.* caro, in sacramento futurum erat. 2. Collatio cum verbis cœnæ. 3. "Quomodo potest, &c." Dominus non correxit eorum sententiam, sed iterum inculcavit, "Nisi, &c. &c." Quis credat rem facillimam, qualis est credere in Christum, voluisse Dominum cum tanto offendiculo discipulorum involvere tot obscuris metaphoris, cum potuisset uno verbo rem totam declarare, &c.? 4. Distinctio frequens carnis et sanguinis, et cibi et potus. 5. Comparatio inter manna, &c. 6. Miracula panum. 7. Amen Amen. 8. Collatio cum cap. iii... Ex testimonio ecclesiæ. Ex patribus.

Not any other scripture is quoted in this chapter. The next is

Transubstantiation proved by testimonies of the fathers.

P. 669. "A compendium of arguments taken from the fathers. Six classes (of arguments). The first will be from the mode in which the fathers speak. The ancients everywhere call it the Lord's body and blood; and they do not this when they speak of other signs. Besides they call it the precious body, tremendous mysteries, pledge of salvation, the price for us. Secondly. From the comparison of this sacrament with other things; (1) With the sacraments of the Hebrews...as truth is expressed by figures, (2) With the mystery of the incarnation, (3) Christ as He is on the altar with the same Christ in the manger and with Christ in heaven, (4) Christ in the eucharist with angels that appear in a bodily form, (5) Those that handle the eucharist unworthily with those that slew Christ. Thirdly. The fathers shew that a real change takes place in many ways. (1) They say that the bread does not remain, (2) That the senses are deceived in this thing, (3) That the bread is changed into flesh as in the process of nutrition, when Christ ate. (4) They compare it to the real changes of water into wine, of the rods into serpents and the like. (5) They say that the omnipotence of God is needed for that change. [*i.e.* The fathers believed it.] Fourthly. From the loftiest mystery which they acknowledged it to be, (1) That it cannot be understood without faith, (2) They used to exhort persons to a sure faith without doubting, (3) That it is a miracle surpassing human understanding, (4) They did not speak of it before the heathen. (5) They remitted the question to simple omnipotence. Fifthly. From their veneration. (1) They

---

*P. 669. Transubstantiatio probatur testimoniis patrum.*

Compendium argumentorum quæ sumuntur ex patribus. Sex classes. Prima (classis) erit ex modo loquendi patrum...Veteres passim appellant corpus et sanguinem Domini, quod non faciunt cum de aliis signis loquuntur. Præterea vocant pretiosum corpus, tremenda mysteria, pignus salutis, pretium nostrum...Secunda erit ex comparatione hujus sacramenti cum aliis rebus; (1) cum sacramentis Hebræorum...ut veritatem a figuris, &c., (2) cum mysterio incarnationis, (3) Christum ut est in altari cum eodem Christo in præsepi et cum Christo in cælo, (4) Christum in eucharistiâ cum angelis apparentibus in formâ corporali, (5) indigne tractantes eucharistiam cum illis qui Christum occiderunt. Tertia. Indicant patres realem mutationem fieri multis modis, (1) dicunt non remanere panem, (2) sensus falli in hac re, (3) sic mutari panem in carnem ut mutabatur per nutritionem Christo comedente, (4) comparant cum realibus mutationibus aquæ in vinum, virgarum in serpentes et similibus, (5) dicunt ad istam mutationem requiri omnipotentiam Dei. Quarta. Ex mysterio altissimo quod...agnoscebant, (1) non posse intelligi sine fide, (2) hortabantur ad fidem certam et ad non dubitandum &c., (3) miraculum esse superans humanum captum, (4) non loquebantur de eo coram ethnicis, &c., (5) remittebant ad omnipotentiam. Quinta.

adored, (2) They invoked the Spirit, &c., (3) They took most diligent heed lest it should fall on the ground, (4) They did not permit it even to be seen by unbelievers, (5) They asserted that angels were standing by. Sixthly. From the effect attributed to it. (1) That Christ is by it united to us bodily, (2) That our bodies will rise, (3) That Christ gives Himself so that we truly have Him within us, (4) That Christ is in reality joined to us, (5) That we are made sharers of the Divine nature. [All this proves I admit that such fathers thought so; but it proves not a bodily presence.]

P. 746. "Transubstantiation from God's Word. Now at length the judgment of the catholic church is to be confirmed, that teaches that the bread is converted into the Lord's body, and that that conversion is the peculiar method of the presence of the Lord's body in the eucharist, from which at the same time will first be confuted the judgment of the Berengarians, which the Lutherans also follow, concerning the simple conjoining of the bread with Christ's body in this sacrament. But the first argument is drawn from those words of the Lord, Receive and eat, *i.e.* My body, Matt. xxvi. For these words of necessity infer either a true change of the bread, as Catholics decide, or a metaphorical change, as Calvinists decide [meaning Swiss and other Protestants who by this time had united on equal terms with Calvin]; but in no way admit the judgment of Lutherans [the pure Lutherans]: for the Lord received bread into His hands and blessed it and gave it to His disciples, and said of it, This is My body. Either

---

Ex veneratione. (1) Adorabant, (2) invocabant, &c., (3) Diligentissime cavebant ne caderet in terram, (4) non permittebant etiam videri ab infidelibus. (5) Asserebant angelos astare, &c. Sexta. Ex effectu quem tribuebant. (1) Nobis uniri per eam Christum corporaliter, (2) nostra corpora resurrectione, (3) Donare Se Christum ut Eum vere habeamus intra nos, (4) conjungi Christum nobis reipsâ, (5) nos fieri Divinæ consortes naturæ.

III. L. 3, c. 19, p. 746.

Probatur ex verbo Dei transubstantiatio. Nunc tandem confirmanda est sententia catholicæ ecclesiæ quæ docet panem converti in corpus Domini et eam conversionem esse propriam rationem præsentis corporis Domini in eucharistiâ, ex quo simul confutabitur prima sententia Berengianorum, quam etiam Lutherani sequuntur, de simplici conjunctione panis cum corpore Domini in hoc sacramento. Primum autem argumentum ducitur ex illis Domini verbis, Accipite et manducate; hoc est corpus Meum, Matt. xxvi. Hæc enim verba necessario inferunt aut veram mutationem panis, ut volunt catholici, aut mutationem metaphorica, ut volunt Calvinistæ, nullo autem modo sententiam Lutheranorum admittunt, nam Dominus accepit in manibus panem, eumque benedixit et dedit discipulis et de eo ait, Hoc est corpus Meum. Vel igitur

therefore by blessing it He changed it into (His) body in reality truly and in the proper sense; or He changed it in a sense not its own and figuratively by adding a meaning which it had not (before), or He did not change it in any way. If He changed it in reality truly and in the proper sense, then He gave them bread which had been changed, and concerning bread which had undergone a change He said with perfect truth, *This is My body*; i.e. which is contained under the species of bread; but is no longer bread but body: and this is what Catholics say. But if anyone say that the bread had been changed figuratively, nevertheless it will be bread that was given to the apostles, which will figuratively be the Lord's body, and those words will have this sense: '*This is My body*' [will be] '*This bread is the figure of My body.*' But this is the judgment of the sacramentaries whom both we and Lutherans with common consent reject. If anyone finally say that there is no change, he will be compelled to say that bread that had undergone no change was given to the apostles, and that it was said regarding it, *This is My body*, i.e. *This* which is true and wheaten bread is truly and in the proper sense *My body*. But I do not admit that this can in any way be, whether we treat of the thing itself or of a mere proposition; for neither is it in any way possible for any one thing not to be changed and yet to be another thing [i.e. that the bread is not changed and yet becomes truly and properly the Lord's body: but the first answer seems to be that we know of no body or individual who ever maintained these two inconsistent opinions. But besides can it pass as correct, to say that his second class, the sacramentarians, believe in a *change* of the bread? Does the addition of a figurative meaning change the bread? Does its being made holy, i.e. set apart for sacred uses, change it? Then is not all this reasoning founded on errors? But I give the rest, and all the more because of Luther's unfortunate admission that he did not know how to over-

---

*benedicendo mutavit in corpus, reipsâ, vere, et proprie; vel mutavit improprie et figurate addendo significationem quam non habebat; vel nullo modo mutavit. Si mutavit reipsâ vere et proprie, ergo panem mutatum dedit, et de pane mutato verissime dixit, Hoc est corpus Meum i.e. quod sub specie panis continetur; non est amplius panis sed corpus: et hoc est quod dicunt catholici. Si vero quis dicat panem mutatum esse figurate, tamen datus erit apostolis panis, qui figurate erit corpus Domini, et illa verba, Hoc est corpus Meum, hunc sensum habebunt, Hic panis est figura corporis Mei. Hæc autem est sententia sacramentariorum, quam et nos et Lutherani communi consensu rejiciamus. Si quis denique dicat nullam fieri mutationem, is cogetur dicere, panem non mutatum datum esse apostolis et de illo esse dictum, Hoc est corpus Meum: i.e. Hic panis verus et triticeus vere et proprie est corpus Meum. Atqui hoc nullo modo admitti potest, sive agamus de re ipsâ, sive de propositione, nec enim ullo modo fieri potest ut una res non mutetur et*



throw it.] Yet it would be itself and not itself. But in an affirmative proposition it is necessary that subject and predicate can be put in each other's place [that both concern the same thing]: otherwise the thing predicated would be false. Therefore it is not possible that a proposition is true in which the man puts bread in the place of subject and the body of Christ as the predicate [*i.e.* in what is attributed to the third class]: for bread and Christ's body are most different things. Luther answered to this argument in his *Captivity of Babylon*, chap. on the eucharist, that we must not make Aristotle judge in so sublime affairs ... If we were to call Aristotle on a question of dialectic or philosophy, such as this on the nature of an affirmative assertion, Luther ought not to take it ill. But we have no need in this of Aristotle, since common sense suffices. For if it is allowed to make affirmations regarding things of different [*i.e.* not of like kinds] you will be able with equal justice to affirm something regarding nothing, &c., &c., &c.

P. 676. "That one body can be in many places at the same time. First. Matt. xix., With God all things are possible (save such as imply a contradiction). Reasons why not a contradiction. (1) Nothing is to be believed without the word of God. But the word of God no where states as an exception to God's omnipotence one body being able to be in two places ... Only those things is God unable to do, to do which would be not to do but to cease to do. But for one body to be in two places cannot be clearly reduced to that form; therefore it ought not to be made an exception.

tamen fit alia. Esset tamen ipsa et non ipsa. In propositione autem affirmativâ necesse ut pro eodem supponant subjectum et prædicatum: alioqui esset falsa prædicatio. Non igitur fieri potest ut vera sit propositio, in quo subjectum supponit pro pane, prædicatum autem pro corpore Christi; panis enim et corpus Christi res diversissimæ sunt. Ad hoc argumentum respondit Lutherus in Cap. Bab. c. de eucharistiâ non oportere Aristotelem judicem facere rerum tam sublimium... Si Aristotelem judicem vocarem in quæstione dialecticâ seu philosophicâ, qualis est hæc de naturâ enunciationis affirmativæ, non deberet id Lutherus ægre ferre. Sed non hic opus habemus Aristotele, cum sensus communis sufficiat. Nam si liceat affirmare disparata de disparatis, licebit affirmare eodem jure de nihilo aliquid, &c. &c.

*Lib. III. c. 3, p. 676.*

Posse unum corpus simul esse in pluribus locis. Primum. Matt. xix., Apud Deum omnia possibilia (præter ea quæ implicant contradictionem). Reasons why this is not such. (1) Nihil esse credendum sine verbo Dei. At verbum Dei nusquam excipit a Dei omnipotentia unum corpus posse esse in duobus locis... Deum illa tantum non posse quæ facere non est facere sed deficere. Sed unum corpus in duobus locis esse non potest clare ad ista reduci: proinde excipi non debuit. (2) Eam esse veram doctrinam quæ Deum exaltat et hominem deprimit, &c. &c. (3) Illa

(2) That is the true doctrine which exalts God and lowers man, &c. (3) Those things imply a contradiction, which are at variance with a thing's essence. But to be in a place is not of the essence of a body ... Second argument, &c., &c.

P. 690. "It is the united judgment of the schools and of the church that the entire Christ is in the eucharist with magnitude and all the accidents, except the relation to a place in Heaven which it has as far as it is in Heaven and to those accidents which ensue upon its existence in that place; and on the other hand that the entire Christ exists in Heaven with magnitude and all the accidents except the relation to the species of bread, which it has as it is in the eucharist, &c., &c., as before. [There is no marvel that arbitrary logic of this kind can fill three folio volumes. Has any single point been proved in these specimens? I think not.]

The passage that Bellarmine refers to is in Vol. II. p. 263, "But they will perhaps say that we are taught out of Aristotle, that you ought to be able to put the subject and predicate of an affirmative proposition in each other's place (*pro eodem supponere*) or, to use the very words from his *Metaphysica* 6, 'For 'an affirmative (proposition) the agreement of the extremes is 'required,' which they explain by the words putting one in 'the other's place (*pro eodem suppositionem*).'" And Luther adds, "Wherefore I say that you cannot put 'bread' in the place of the subject but you can Christ's body." ... See Whately, p. 62, (or any writer on logic), the subject of an affirmative proposition must agree with the predicate. Luther says, This is not the case if you put bread for "This" in "This is My body," but that if you understand "This My body is My body," the two agree.

Bellarmino alludes also to the following sentence: "What shall we say here? when we make Aristotle and human doctrines judges of such sublime and Divine things? Why should we not get rid of that curious enquiry, and simply stick fast to Christ's words, prepared not to know what takes place there,

---

*implicant contradictionem, quæ pugnant cum essentia rei... At esse in loco non est de essentia corporis...Secundum argumentum, &c. &c.*

IV. c. 5, p. 690.

*Sententia communis scholarum et ecclesiæ est, in eucharistiâ totum Christum existere cum magnitudine et omnibus accidentibus, exceptâ relatione ad locum cœlestem quam habet ut est in cœlo, et iis quæ ad existentiam in eo loco consequuntur; et contra in cœlo totum Christum existere cum magnitudine et omnibus accidentibus, exceptâ relatione ad speciem panis, quam habet ut est in eucharistiâ, &c. &c.*

"&c.?" B. makes it as if Luther renounced Aristotle's tests in this case. But does he not argue that they are in his own favour; and then rhetorically add, "but we ought to have our faith in a "simpler form"? If this be so B. has very much misrepresented L.

But to look a little closer into this matter. B. has asserted that the Lutheran sense will not stand in logic, though the Calvinist might; but that those that deny all change cannot in logic stand at all: but he has not given the syllogisms for each. Let us attempt it.

First the Catholic.

(Real) bread is not (real) flesh :

"This" bread is (real) flesh :

So "this" is not (real) bread.

The objection to this is that the middle proposition is faulty. It assumes the question. For it takes Christ's rhetorical words for logical. It ought to run thus, What Christ said was, This (bread) was flesh. So this proposition does not agree with the first which is composed of logical terms, and it will run thus :

Real bread is not real flesh :

This real bread is rhetorical flesh

So rhetorical flesh is not real flesh.

Second the Calvinist.

Real bread is not real flesh :

This bread is figuratively flesh :

So this bread is not real flesh.

But this assumes the question the other way.

The third would run thus :

Real bread is not real flesh without a change :

This bread is not changed :

So this bread is not real flesh.

But how is it that logic is in this case so useless? May I venture to say that "This is My body" is not a logical proposition at all; but a rhetorical? To take it therefore in the Roman sense brings us into inexplicable difficulties. "This thing (bread) will "become My body" is logical and as they say "catholic:" but to say "This bread is My body" is logically untrue, for in their view it is not, directly the sentence is done. (See remarks by H. H.

Cent. 19.) At the beginning of the sentence it is bread; and when it is ended, it is body or flesh. Nor is this simply an artificial difficulty but inherent in the nature of things. Now take the Calvinist, as he is called, "This is a figure of My body." A figure is not real flesh. So this is not real flesh. It is all strict logic. "Is" in those words of Christ can only be made logical by some explanatory addition to one or other of the three terms (This) (is) or (My body). I rather suppose Luther meant this when he said you cannot put bread as the subject: if you put Christ's body for the predicate the two do not agree, if the term "is" connects them.

The two arguments of Bellarmine might with even greater ease be shewn to be unsound. Consult his Third Book (Vol. I.) "On the Truth of Christ's body in the Eucharist," and its third chapter, "That one body can at the same time be in more places" (than one). It is sufficient to reply that the word of God never makes it an exception to God's omnipotence that He cannot do such a thing as to make two and two five, and that it is a contradiction to say that a limited organised body can be everywhere. And we confidently assert that if you take away a portion of the properties of manhood, you have not real manhood remaining, but another thing.

Bellarmino and Hooker's friend Saravia *seem* to think that these statements are not regarding "res disparatæ"; but there is a great difference between many Roman writers and Bellarmine.

(I.L.) RODOLPH HOSPINIAN, THE GREAT CHANCELLOR OF  
ZURICH. B. 1547. D. 1626.

Born at Altorf, and eminent in the Church of Zwingel.

He published several works besides that to which we have to refer, *viz.* his treatise *De Historiâ sacramentariâ*. Unnoticed by many writers on the church he has at length floated to the surface; and I place him here before his time, because it seems desirable to shew that he misinterpreted Zwingel, because his own views differed from Zwingel's. His other works are "On Monks," "The Christian festivals," and "A history of the Jesuits." The obligations of the clergy to such laymen are great; but we cannot for that reason pass over any mistakes into which we judge that they have fallen. Truth is our aim.

The Roman writers confess his style to be pure and clear, and allow that he has overthrown Bellarmine in points of historical fact, and say that no one has so well distinguished the characteristic marks of the various religious bodies and sects that have separated from Rome. But small credit is given to his interpretations of the passages he cites from the fathers. In 1681 his works, issued from Geneva, reached the length of seven folio volumes. He is strong against Lutheran peculiarities.

II. 27. "Zwingel's doctrine and opinion regarding the Lord's supper. If he taught that bread signifies Christ's body and wine His blood, in a way of signifying proper and peculiar to the sacraments, he certainly did not understand this signification to be empty, void or bare without a most fixed idea of the presence of the thing signified, &c. For taking a part for the whole—he did not so interpret the calling bread and wine by the name of Christ's body and blood as to take away the substance of bread and wine; and now to have nothing left but Christ's body and blood; but he says that both are so in the appearances under the name of the thing signified, that the sign also is comprehended and brought to us.... For he taught that the true body of the Lord itself, which was delivered up for us and His true blood which was shed for us on the cross, are truly eaten and drunk (by us) unto eternal life.... He taught also that we must believe God's words and not too curiously enquire into them. [That Zwingel has sometimes, I believe from pure desire of unity, let fall expressions approaching to this picture of his doctrine I admit: but take most of his writings—I may say almost all—take his testimony at Marburg—and no one could then accept this picture as here drawn by this Chancellor of Zurich, writing in a later age. May I be defended from my friend's

*Vol. II. p. 27.*

Zuinglii doctrina et sententia de cenâ Domini...Si panem corpus Christi et vinum sanguinem *significare* (Zuinglius) docuit, modo significandi sacramentis proprio et peculiari, non intellexit profecto hanc significationem inanem vacuum aut nudam sine certissimâ *rei* significatæ *presentia*, &c....Namque, partem pro toto accipio, panemque et vinum corporis et sanguinis Christi nomine appellari non ita interpretatus est, ut sublâtâ panis et vini substantiâ nihil jam fiat præter corpus et sanguinem Christi reliquum; sed *utrumque* ait *simul ita inesse* sub nomine rei significatæ ut signum quoque comprehendatur et afferatur...Docuit enim ipsum Domini *verum corpus*, quod traditum est pro nobis, et *verum Ejus sanguinem* qui in cruce pro nobis effusus est, *vere manducari et bibi* ad vitam æternam...Docuit quoque credendum esse verbis Dei et non curiosius in illa inquirendum...Falsissimum igitur est quod...item a pane et vino corpus et sanguinem Christi *abstrahat, cœloque concludat*,

defences.] It is therefore most false that he takes away Christ's body and blood from the (visible) bread and wine, and shuts up (the body and blood) in Heaven. [Is not this asserting that Z. would *not* have subscribed to the words, The natural body is in heaven and not here? *i.e.* that Zwingel was less clear on this point than the Church of England. See Part III. of this book.] He interpreted Christ's words in the same way in which the fathers did in the primitive church. Again however, to explain and *render all perspicuous*, he added that this is not done corporeally, but spiritually by faith... [Zwingel did use two kinds of speaking that are incompatible, and it is singular that in one of the few slips of this kind that Zwingel made, he writes in his letter to the Emperor] That the Lord's body is present substantially and corporally, but not in material quantity or in location in one place; [which seems as if Zwingel was at that time inclined to admit the possibility of a peculiar mode of presence, such as Bellarmine and Maldonat afterwards asserted. These are the spots on the Zurich planet. Let any one read his last letter to Bucer, Vol. VIII. Zurich edition.]

To do honour to Hospinian's book as an historical and antiquarian work, I extract "The Liturgy instituted by Zwingel in the church of Zurich in the celebration of the Lord's supper."

"When the sermon is done, the table in the church (temple) is strewed (laid) with a clean cloth. On this is set a basket full of unfermented bread, plates and cups of wood, which are filled with wine. The pastor of the church approaches to the table with the deacons, and directs the whole assembly to give attention. Afterwards another of the deacons lays before them the account of the institution of the Lord's supper from the [first] epistle to the Corinthians. But another recites a part of the sixth of John that all may learn from the Lord's words how we may truly eat Christ's flesh and drink His blood. [I believe "truly" here means "in the

---

&c. &c. Verba Christi eodem modo, quo patres in primitiva ecclesia, interpretatus est. After passages like these Hospinian goes on, Rursus tamen explicandi et perspicuitatis gratiâ, addidit fieri hæc *non corporaliter* sed spiritualiter per fidem.... Corpus Domini adesse substantialiter et *corporaliter*, sed non quantitative aut in loco.

*Liturgia a Zuinglio in ecclesia Tigurina in cœnæ Dominicæ  
celebratione instituta.*

Finitâ concione, mensa in templo mundâ mappâ insternitur. Huic imponitur canistrum pane infermentato plenum, catini et pocula lignea, quæ vino implentur. Accedit ad mensam pastor ecclesiæ cum diaconis et totum cœtum ad attentionem excitat. Mox alter ex diaconis subjicit institutionem cœnæ Domini ex epistolâ ad Corinthios. Alter vero recitat partem capitis vi. Johannis, ut ex verbis Domini omnes discant quomodo Christi carnem edamus vere, et sanguinem Ejus bibamus.

"antitypes" as the word is used by our Lord—not "in true natural body."] Presently after reciting the creed the pastor admonishes each to examine and search himself that he may not by approaching unworthily become chargeable with the body and blood of the Lord. Afterwards all fall on their knees and after the pastor say the Lord's prayer. When this is finished the pastor receives (takes) unfermented bread into his hands, and, while the assembly of the faithful is looking on, with a loud voice and with great reverence recites from the gospels the institution of the Lord's supper, then he distributes the bread to the ministers and hands the cup: and they carry round the bread in plates and the wine in cups and supply it to the church. Each one takes in his hands what is handed by the ministers; eats and offers to the one sitting next to him a part of that which he has received: in like manner also he hands the cup. But in the meantime, while they are eating of the Lord's bread and drinking of His cup, one of the church's ministers reads from St John's Gospel those most sweet conversations of our Lord which He had with His disciples when He was about to go away, from the feet-washing making a beginning. If the plates and cups return to the table (empty), the church again falls down on its knees and gives thanks to God for the benefit of Christ's redemption. But in the churches of the territory of Zurich the minister recites all alone and the people come singly to the table. Many churches in Switzerland and elsewhere afterwards copied this rite." [The same is printed in the works of Zwingel. I suppose "if" means "when." Does "singly" mean that as one goes away another takes his place at the table?]

This book of Hospinian forms a thick folio of 1600 pages. It

---

Mox, recitato symbolo fidei, pastor admonet ut quisque seipsum examinet et exploret, ne indigne accedendo corporis et sanguinis Domini reus fiat. Postea omnes se in genua demittunt, et pastore præeunte orationem Dominicam dicunt. Quâ absolutâ, pastor panem infermentatum in manus accipit, et, spectante fidelium cœtu, altâ voce magnâque religione institutionem cœnæ Dominicæ ex evangeliiis recitat, deinde panem ministris distribuit et poculum porrigit: qui panem in catinis et vinum in cyathis circumferunt et ecclesiæ exhibent. Quisque in manus sumit quod traditur a ministris, edit, et proxime assidenti offert partem ejus quod accipit; similiter etiam poculum porrigit. Interim vero, dum de pane Domini edunt et de poculo Ejus bibunt, unus ex ecclesiæ ministris prælegit ex evangelio Johannis dulcissima illa Domini colloquia, quæ abiturus cum discipulis habuit a pedum ablutione initium faciens, &c. Si catini et pocula ad mensam redeunt, ecclesia iterum in genua procumbit et Deo pro beneficio redemptionis Christi gratias agit. In ecclesiis autem agri Tigurini minister omnia solus recitat, et ad mensam singuli accedunt. Hunc ritum multæ ecclesiæ in Helvetiâ et Rebetiâ postea imitatae sunt.

contains much that is exceedingly valuable; but it is written to prove what never can be proved, that the fathers in general were very little removed from being Zwinglians. I have read much of his writing, but it is always the same story. For this purpose the fathers are tamed down from their high transcendental flights; and he vainly endeavours to tune up Zwingel to their pitch. But it is the Æschylean simile of oil and water. They will not mingle. Zwingel does not sing to the fathers' tunes, and the fathers cannot be brought down to walk quietly with Zwingel on his New Testament level. Hospinian has taken the method of laying down all the propositions in succession which make up eucharistic doctrine, and under each head he gives quotations from certain fathers. I hope to stand excused for taking another plan, *viz.* putting into view all the fathers and great doctors one by one. The plan gives a fairer trial to each—as sufficient extracts are brought into view at once from that one man's writing to enable the reader to pass an enlightened verdict upon him. And I think the conclusion is fatal to Hospinian's decision that Zwingel virtually agreed with the fathers.

(MM.) DR WILLIAM WHITAKER. B. 1547. D. 1595.

Born at Holme in Burnley, Lancashire.

By his uncle Alexander Nowell's influence he went to Dr Colet's new foundation of St Paul's School: and to Trinity, Cambridge, and was made successively Regius Professor of Divinity, and Chancellor of St Paul's, and Master of St John's. He translated Jewel against Harding into Latin. His Disputation on Scripture, or six questions on the First Controversy, is dedicated to the great Lord Burleigh. Bellarmine had his portrait in his study. He fully answered the Jesuit Campian.

P. 252. Parker Society. "Against making secret the sacraments. What advantage would a Gentile or anyone unacquainted with the sacrament suppose to accrue to an infant by merely seeing it baptized? What advantage in his opinion would a Christian receive by taking a morsel of bread and a few drops of wine? Surely nothing could be conceived more foolish to one who was not acquainted with the reason and object of the ceremonies? These therefore should not be concealed but explained to the people:



and the hiding of them is an antichristian device to fill the people with a stupid admiration of they know not what. ... Christ instituted such sacraments to instruct us through our very senses. That was the end of the institution thereof."

He died through travelling from London to Cambridge, "it being well midwinter and sharp weather."

(NN.) DAVID PAREUS, PROFESSOR AT HEIDELBERG.  
B. 1548. D. 1622.

A proof of the uncertainty of fame upon this earth. One could write a considerable list of leading ecclesiastical works in which he is ignored by German as well as by English writers: and yet he was once so noted even in England that Milton quoted his explanation of the Revelation with great praise, and our James I. did him the singular honour of burning his treatise on Paul's epistle to the Romans, saying that it contained doctrines adverse to his own royal ideas upon monarchy. He was also one of the few Germans who in the time of Luther ventured to sigh for lost unity: and yet one of the cited passages is amply sufficient to shew that he was neither willing to sacrifice Bible truth to attain it, nor slow to give to dangerous errors their true names. He appears to me to take high rank among the Protestant writers of the sixteenth century. He was born at Frankenstein in Silesia. His proper name was Wangler, which he dropped as was the fashion for a Latinized Greek name Pareus: that and Wangler both signifying an unusual development of the cheekbone (*trapela*)! He attained the high rank at Heidelberg of Professor and State Councillor. He has left a Commentary on all the New Testament. It fills a very large folio. There is also a work on celibacy and an Irenicum, a plea for union by a conciliatory Synod in 1614.

Possibly his not holding consubstantial opinions may have caused him to be less thought of in Germany. His commentary on the Corinthians is in the scholastic manner. The specimen given will shew its acuteness.

The Parisian Dictionnaire Universel gives a small portrait of him, of a stately air and without any unusual prominence of cheekbone. Although King James I. delivered his exposition of the Romans to the flames, it is mainly against the Pope's

authority ; and only opposes civil tyranny in its way towards the papal or ecclesiastical. See p. 262 of that Treatise on Epistle to the Romans (xiii.), Frankfurt, 1647. The "sacred right of insurrection" is very cautiously stated ; and the doctrine is drawn out in seven propositions by Pareus, and they are elaborately defended by his son Philip (a lover of Plautus) in the columns following. The disputed Prop. iv. may be thus rendered : "It is lawful for "private persons in present peril to defend themselves against a "tyrant, who robs or assaults or is an adulterer or makes an attack "on them, if they cannot defend themselves by ordinary means nor "escape the peril in any other way. They may then deal with him "as they would with a private ruffian."

Commentaries. P. 211. "The mystery of His own body and blood, which He entrusted to us, to be celebrated in the church henceforth with giving of thanks, with breaking and eating of the sacred bread and drinking of the sacred wine for a perpetual memory of His own death for us, as a bond of fraternal love until He come. This most holy institute of the Saviour the devil early began to deprave by various superstitions and corruptions, until at length he transformed it with a horrible contempt of the Lord's death into the abominable idol of a theatrical mass. It would take long to set forth the origin of so great an evil. I will repeat it briefly, &c., &c. At those ancient times the name of a sacrifice was so sacred among Gentiles and among Jews, that it was considered that there could be no religion without a sacrifice. [As Waterland shews, Papists are obliged to allow that the death of Christ is in every point of the definition a sacrifice.] But the Christians were specially hated with reference to this name, because they were said to have taken away all the sacrifices of the Jews and the Gentiles, and to be alone without a sacrifice and to

*Opera Theol. Exegetica*, p. 211. Frankfurt, 1647.

Mysterium corporis et sanguinis Sui, quod cum gratiarum actione, fractione, et manducatione sacri panis, et bibitione sacri poculi in mortis Suae pro nobis gratam memoriam, et fraternæ dilectionis perpetuum vinculum deinceps in ecclesiæ celebrari mandavit donec veniat. Hoc sanctissimum Servatoris institutum Satan variis superstitionibus et corruptelis depravare mature cœpit, donec tandem, cum horribili mortis Domini contumeliâ in abominandum theatricæ missæ idolum transformavit. Originem tanti mali explicare longum esset. Repetam paucis, &c. &c. Priscis illis temporibus apud gentes et apud Judæos nomen sacrificii adeo sanctum erat, ut absque sacrificio nulla haberetur religio. Christiani vero hoc nomine præcipue invisi erant, quod omnia gentilium et Judæorum sacrificia sustulisse, solique sacrificio carere, et hostes

be hostile to sacrifices. The bishops of the Christians, thinking that so great an odium had to be escaped, began to give the name of sacrifice to the mystery of Christ's body and blood both in addresses and in treatises.

P. 212. "The eucharistic sacrifice was changed under the name of the mass into a propitiatory sacrifice, in which it is pretended by the priest, who performs mass and who murmurs in a low voice a consecration of five words over the host, *i.e.* 'For this 'is My body,' that in the last instant of pronouncing the syllable 'um,' the bread is transmuted into the substance of Christ's body, and this is daily offered to God the Father, for the expiation of all sins and for the redemption of the living upon earth and of the dead both in heaven and in purgatory: which is the veriest abnegation of Christ's true sacrifice once fulfilled on the cross, and repugnant to sacred Scripture by which Christ is taught to have consecrated and perfected by His one oblation all that ever approach to God!... The chief sources of strength (to this corruption) lie on the one hand in certain external rites, as vestments, and hymns expressive of the mass, altars, round hosts, &c., and on the other hand in doctrine, as the opinion of Christ's bodily presence under the host of bread is fought for by not a few even to the teeth. And since the Reformed churches wholly cut these sources of strength, therefore Satan has now for 90 years stirred a schism on chief points between our churches and theirs, and has turned this most healthful feast, which the Lord appointed to be to Christians the

---

sacrificiorum esse dicerentur. Episcopi Christianorum, tantam invidiam declinandam esse existimantes, nomen sacrificii mysterio corporis et sanguinis Christi concionibus et scriptis indere ceperunt. [Justin M. first uses the word *θυσίας* first doubtfully and then beyond all question regarding the Lord's supper. See extracts, or Table of Contents.]

P. 212.

Sacrificium eucharisticum sub nomine Missæ in sacrificium, *λαστικόν*, propitiatorium conversum fuit, in quo fingitur a sacerdote missificante, demurmurante consecrationem quinque verborum super hostiam, Hoc enim est corpus Meum, in extremo instanti syllabæ "um," panem transmutari in substantiale corpus Christi; hocque Deo Patri quotidie offerri pro expiatione omnium peccatorum, et redemptione viventium in terrâ et mortuorum existentium in cœlo et purgatorio: quæ est ipsissima veri sacrificii Christi, in cruce semel peracti, abnegatio, repugnans Scripturæ sacræ, quâ Christus unicâ oblatione consecrasset et perfecisset docetur omnes quicumque ad Deum accedunt...Præcipui quidem nervi tum in ritibus quibusdam externis, ut sunt vestes et hymni missales altaria rotundæ hostiæ, &c., tum in doctrinâ ut opinio corporalis præsentis Christi sub hostiâ panis a non paucis mordicus adhuc defendatur. Quos nervos quia ecclesiæ reformatæ penitus inciderent, hinc inter nostras et illorum ecclesias capitale schisma ab annis jam 90 Satan concitavit, sanumque hoc epulum, quod Dominus dulcissimum concordis et

most sweet bond of concord and unity, into an apple of the saddest strife, matter of schism and contention. But it only remains that all we lovers of concord call on God with ardour, that He Himself from His concealment behind the scenes may deign to shew and open to us the way of peace.

P. 139. "Some of the sounder Lutherans despise the word consubstantiation, but all hold the thing: that with the substance of the bread there is really in the same place the substance of (Christ's) body. Therefore they think that two substances are really under the same accidents in one place. [So put, it does not make Christ present, but only His substance.] This truly is consubstantiation. But our enquiry is not about the word, but about the thing; what kind of existence [of Christ's body] we say is adverse to the word of God and to the Christian faith; and we refute it from the words of the Lord. Bread is Christ's body. So Christ's body does not exist nor is latent with bread, really, in the bread; as the seven cows were seven years. So there were not nor were latent really in the seven cows seven years.

"On the causes of the real presence ... They pretend causes which do not exist. The third is the ubiquity of Christ's body. This assumption we deny: for neither is it true that Christ's body is everywhere. The proof from its union [*i.e.* with God] is nothing. For there was union when there was no ubiquity: *i.e.* in the whole state of Christ's humiliation the union was unbroken, with no ubiquity. The causes assigned are the words Christ used, and the power of God.

unitatis vinculum Christianis esse voluit, in *μῆλον ἔριδος* tristissimæ, dissidii et contentionis materiam, convertit, &c. Non superest vero nisi ut omnes concordie amantes ardenter Deum invocemus, ut Ipse *ἀπὸ μηχανῆς* viam pacis nobis monstrare et aperire dignetur.

*Part IV. P. 139. 1 Corinthians, written before Com. on Matt.*

Fastidiunt quidam Lutherani saniores consubstantiationis vocabulum; sed rem omnes tenent: quod cum panis substantiâ realiter eodem loco adsit substantia corporis. Ergo duas substantias uno loco sub iisdem accidentibus realiter adesse sentiunt. Hoc vero est consubstantiatio. Verum non quæritur de voce sed de re, &c., qualem existentiam verbo Dei et fidei Christianæ adversam esse dicimus et ex verbis Domini refellimus. Panis est corpus Christi. Ergo non cum pane in pane realiter est vel latet corpus Christi: sicut septem vaccæ erant septem anni; ergo non in septem vaccis realiter erant vel latebant septem anni.

De causis realis præsentie... Fingunt causas quæ non sunt. III. Ab ubiquitate. Et hæc assumptio negatur. Neque enim verum est corpus Christi esse ubique. Ex unione non probatur. Fuit enim unio quando non fuit ubiquitas; in toto statu humilitatis salva fuit unio absque ubiquitate. I. Is a verbis, II. a potentiâ Dei.

P. 136. "Papists and Lutherans agree in this, that the body is therefore really present in the signs, that it may be eaten with the mouth of the body by all that communicate. But they differ in that Papists affirm and Lutherans deny that it is therefore really present, that it may be adored by the people and may be offered by the priests for a sacrifice to God for the sins of the living and the dead.

Pareus next shews that in his time men generally believed in a real and invisible presence of Christ in the bread and wine in the place and at the place of bread and wine in the eucharist. He only does not say on the altar, and we may infer from what he has just said that he denies this last point on behalf of the Lutherans. And against this real invisible presence of Christ's body he ranges his objections under as many as 20 heads. Then he treats on the mode.

P. 140. "The orthodox opinion, &c. Whether any and what kind of presence of Christ's body ought to be established as in the Lord's supper? It appears that none ought to be established, because Christ did not say 'Here is My body.' Nor is the body's presence in the supper obtained from any other part of God's word, &c. And the phrase 'concerning the presence' seems to foster a carnal opinion about the existence of the body under the bread: it also seems to be repugnant to the end of the eucharist, which is the commemoration or memory of the Lord's death. But a memory is not of things present but of things absent, &c. *On the other hand*, that the bread is [called] 'Christ's body delivered for us.' Bread truly cannot be said not to be present in the eucharist.

P. 136.

Papistæ et Lutherani conveniunt in eo quod corpus ideo realiter sit præsens in symbolis ut ore corporeo manducetur omnibus communicantibus. Dissident vero in eo quod Papistæ affirmant Lutherani negant, id eo adesse ut adoretur a populo et offeratur a sacerdotibus in sacrificium Deo pro peccatis viventium et mortuorum.

P. 140.

Sententia orthodoxa, &c. An aliqua et qualis præsentia corporis Christi statuenda sit in cenâ Domini? Videtur autem quod nulla sit statuenda, quia Christus non dixit Hic est corpus Meum. Nec præsentia corporis in cenâ aliunde habetur ex verbo Dei, &c. Et phrasis de præsentia videtur fovere carnalem opinionem de existentia corporis sub pane: pugnare etiam cum fine eucharistiæ qui est commemoratio seu memoria mortis Domini. Memoria autem non est præsentium sed absentium, &c. Sed *contra* est—quod panis est corpus Christi pro nobis "traditum:" panis vero præsentia in eucharistiâ negari non potest.

*Besides*, we are ordered to eat the bread as Christ's body delivered for us. *But*, what is in no way present in the eucharist can in no way be eaten. *Besides*, bread is said to be a communion of Christ's body. *But* there is no communion bestowed of that which is simply absent. It will appear then that Christ [*i.e.* His entire humanity] is simply absent from His supper, and nothing but bare signs of His body are left for us. Both of these propositions have been objected to and are customarily objected to as against our churches by our opponents." [The expression "bare signs" has from a very early age been a very invidious phrase. And it has been misinterpreted as if it denied all gifts of grace in the supper. It means the bread and the wine without the body and the blood.]

This writer surely merited the attention of Gieseler, Hagenbach, Neander, Mosheim, and other great writers. Luther is (in part) inimitable in his own line; but in the close anatomy of assertions and in the discrimination of ideas this writer seems to be more excellent than it was possible for the public combatants to become.

The statement of Pareus that as to Christ's body and bread consubstantiation means two kinds of substances under one set of accidents (those of bread), does not seem to be borne out by Luther's language in many if not in most cases. Take his Babylonish Captivity de Cœnâ Domini, near the part to which Bellarmine refers as to Luther's treatment of Aristotle. Luther writes, "But why could not Christ make His own body to be contained" (*cur non posset corpus Suum contineri*) within the substance of "bread as well as in the accidents (of bread)?" Does anyone affirm that when Luther said "His own body," Luther did not mean its accidents as well as its substance? His illustration wants the word "heat" instead of "fire," but it not the less illustrates this point. "Behold fire and iron are two substances but they are mingled in "ignited iron: so that any part of it is iron and fire. Why is not "Christ's glorious body much more able to be thus present in any "part of the substance of the bread?" He does not say "the

---

*Præterea.* Jubemur panem, ut corpus Christi pro nobis traditum, manducare. *At.* Quod nullo modo præsens est in eucharistiâ nullo modo potest manducari. *Præterea.* Panis dicitur *κοινωνία* corporis Christi. *At.* Simpliciter absentis nulla datur *κοινωνία*. *Denique.* Videbitur Christus ex cœnâ Suâ simpliciter excludi [*i.e.* Christi humanitas tota] et nuda symbola [humanitatis Ejus] relinqui: quod utrumque objectum fuit et objici solet nostris ecclesiis ab adversariis.

"substance of Christ's body" but "Christ's body," *i.e.* substance and accidents in one. Therefore in the remarks at the end of the extracts from the Capel-Liddon controversy, as well as in earlier remarks, we are free not to adopt Pareus' definition of consubstantiation, and to identify it with Luther's idea of it. I know not how Pareus came to write so. Had the current definition of consubstantiation changed? Pareus might have made an assertion of transubstantiation, *viz.* that there is but one set of accidents. The contrary assertion is the current one.

(OO.) DR ROBERT ABBOT, BISHOP OF SALISBURY. B. 1560.  
D. 1617.

Master of Balliol, Professor of Divinity, brother of the Primate.

Although manliness and keenness of intellect and largeness of learning distinguished him exceedingly, yet he seems to have been equally distinguished by humility. The attainment of high positions made no difference in him. It is said that he was just the same man, when he had fallen in with the commonest work of life's duty, as when he moved in the highest walks, the observed of all observers. His biographer sweetly says of him, that he was like a violet, which, if made to grow in the midst of a bank or at the lowest level or at the very highest station, has everywhere its own simple lovely shape and colour and its own fragrant scent. His overthrow of William Bishop, Titular of Chalcedon, who had attempted to disprove a part of John Perkins' Reformed Catholic, was so complete that it caused him to be classed with Jewel for overthrowing Harding, and with Bishop Bilson for answering Allen: and it made men wish that William Bishop had attacked the whole of Perkins' work, that we might have obtained from this Abbot's pen a confutation coextensive with the whole. But his *Antichristi Demonstratic* is judged complete and powerful; and King James paid him the highest honour in his power for it. As Master of Balliol he wrought a great moral reform. Finding the five o'clock chapels were escaped by many, he postponed the service three hours and closed the college gates, in order to diminish and discover noctivagators. He also succeeded in appeasing strife in the college, and it is said that he drew more fish by casting his line in a still

stream than his predecessors had done in the long-troubled waters. His native place was Guildford in Surrey. He wrote against Bellarmine and Suares on the Royal Supremacy; and against Garnet. It was through Bancroft's influence that he was set over Balliol. William Bishop in vain tempted him to reproaches and calumnious language. He probably knew Quintilian's condemnation of some unprincipled advocates who were wont "*causæ vitia convitiis ex-plere*," of which the English is, "When there is no case, abuse the opposite side." Humility set him out of the reach of this temptation.

*The Reformed Catholic, Answer to Dr. Bishop's letter to King.*  
London, 1611.

P. 179. "Because Eusebius mentions 'unbloody sacrifice,' must we hereby conceive to be meant the sacrament of the mass, a true and real sacrifice, wherein the very body and blood of Christ, really and substantially present, is offered to God for propitiation of sins both of quick and dead? Euseb. Demonstrat. Evang. Christ, having offered a marvellous sacrifice and most excellent oblation for our salvation, did deliver unto us to offer unto God a memorial or remembrance thereof instead of a sacrifice. The remembrance of which sacrifice we have learned to perform at His table by the signs of His body and blood. The manner of the other (*i.e.* of unreformed catholics) is indeed to call the celebration of the sacrament by the name of a sacrifice. Aug. Epist. 23, &c.

P. 181. "To a true and real sacrifice there is necessary a true and real death or destroying of the thing sacrificed. Bellarm. de Missâ, l. 2 and 29. But there is now no true and real death or destroying of the body of Christ, and therefore now there can be no true and real sacrifice thereof. With such argument the great Jesuit is so troubled that he staggereth like a drunken man, and indeed knoweth not what to say; neither can Mr Bishop with all his fellows devise a salve to help that sore. The Jesuit telleth us for answer to the matter that by consecration the body of Christ is ordained to a true, real and external alteration and destruction. He telleth us that by consecration the body of Christ receiveth the form of food; and food is ordained for eating, and consequently for alteration and destruction. Let Justin Martyr teach us, Dial. cum Tryphone; who saith that prayers and thanksgivings are the only sacrifices that Christians have received to offer, that by their dry and moist nourishment (*i.e.* the outward elements of bread and wine) they may be admonished of those things which God, the Son of God, hath suffered for them, plainly instructing us, &c.



(PP.) DR RICHARD HOOKER. B. 1553. D. 1600.

Who can praise him, that even a Pope praised, a man whose mind was almost a complete microcosm, having intelligent perception of almost everything then known in the world, and who perhaps wanted only a little less of the concentrativeness or of the limitation often adhering to concentrativeness, to deserve the praise of Bacon's idea, "turning on the poles of truth"? As it is, if you want a description of church privileges, Hooker will give them lofty stature, and if you desire their due limitation by royal supremacy, Hooker will mark that out too. Justification is his accredited subject: and on the Lord's supper he runs with so fine an edge on his thoughts, that he has to be reserved, mainly at least, for the closer scrutiny of our Third Portion. He was born at Heavitree near Exeter. Corpus Christi, Oxford, claims his training. He was placed there by Jewel. Several places own his residence for a time; but little Bishop's bourne and Salisbury Cathedral are the places to which we resort as pilgrims with sweet remembrances of his beautiful writings. Yet the mastership of the Temple is the seat of his dignity. There has never been and perhaps never will be a second Hooker. It takes great presumption to claim to be his successor, the Hooker of modern times.

The two most notable admirers of his Ecclesiastical Polity were Pope Clement VIII. and Charles I. The former seems to have been unable to express the admiration that he felt for it without a very singular hyperbole, saying that it would last when fire had devoured all other products of knowledge or science in the world. The English monarch recommended it to his children and perused it himself from the beginning to the end. It is no marvel that the authenticity of the last three books is disputed. They speak too plainly on the royal supremacy to be easily acknowledged by its opponents.

His uncle John Hooker was a learned antiquary, born at Exeter in 1524, and of the University of Oxford, and was a deputy in Parliament for his native city in 1571, and he was one of those who assisted Hollingshed in compiling his Chronicles.

*Eccl. Polity, Bk. V. p. 307, 8. Keble's Edition. Oxford.*

"As for the sacraments, they really exhibit—What? But for aught we can gather out of that which is written of them [*i.e.* in

the Scriptures] they are not really—What? Nor do they really contain in themselves that grace which *with them or by them* it pleaseth God to *bestow*.

Vol. III. Pt. II. p. 762. *On having Christ in us.* “How to construe this we are to seek. Some think it to be a point inexplicable. Others, (considering that, forasmuch as the end of all speech is to impart to others the mind of him that speaketh, the words which God so often uttereth on this point must needs be frivolous and vain, if to conceive the meaning of them were a thing impossible,) have therefore expounded our conjunction ‘with Christ’ to be a mutual participation, whereby each is blended with the other, *His flesh and blood with ours* and ours in like sort with His, even as really, materially and naturally, as wax melted and blended with wax in one lump; no other difference but that this mixture may be sensibly perceived, that not. *Which gross conceit* doth fight openly against reason. For are not we and Christ personally distinguished [*i.e.* distinct]? Are we not locally divided and severed from each other?

Gal. iv. 19. “Till Christ be formed in you.” “Did the blessed apostle mean materially and really to create Christ in them, flesh and blood, soul and body? No. Christ in us, saith Gregory Naz. not *κατὰ τὸ φαινόμενον*, but *κατὰ τὸ νοούμενον*, not according to that natural substance which visibly was seen on earth, but according to that intellectual comprehension that the mind is capable of. So that the difference between *Christ on earth* and *Christ in us* is no less than between a ship on the sea, and in the mind of him that buildeth it [it is Christ’s Godhead that is now in us. His manhood was with His Godhead in the world], the one a sensible thing [*i.e.* His manhood once in the world] the other the shape of a thing sensible [we mistake if we have the idea of His manhood with us now]. That whereby the apostle did form Christ was the Gospel: so that Christ was formed when Christianity was comprehended [*i.e.* embraced, possessed, and Mr Keble’s heading is “Our union with Christ in no sense corporal.”].

P. 833. “One body, whereof the Head is Christ... That which linketh Christ to us is His mere mercy and love towards us, ... who be inwardly in heart the lively members of His body; and the polished stones of this building coupled and joined to Christ, as flesh of His flesh and bone of His bones, by the mutual bond of His unspeakable love toward them, and through unfeigned faith in Him thus linked and fastened each to other by a spiritual, sincere, and hearty affection and love.... Threefold separation by heresy, schism, or apostasy. [N.B. A chapter is to be given to Hooker in Part III.]

(QQ.) DR ADRIAN SARAVIA. B. 1530. D. 1611.

Archdeacon Denison has printed and translated his treatise on the holy eucharist from a MS. in the British Museum. Foreigners have known Saravia as the publisher of various treatises in one vol. quarto, and of a treatise on the degrees of holy orders. Pierre Burmanns gives a bad opinion of him. Against this we have to set off what Joseph Walton says of him in the life of Hooker, that he was very intimate with that very excellent Christian, and that on the day before Hooker's death he had a conversation with him "On the benefit, the necessity and the safety of the church's "absolution;" also that "it was resolved that the Doctor (Saravia) "should give him both that and the sacrament the day following, "&c." It is right to add that these two, Hooker and Saravia, were well acquainted with the secrets of each other's souls, for "they "were supposed" to confess their faults to one another, and no doubt to pray for one another that they might be healed. I have put this matter in the most winning terms—those of the Bible. But these terms of St James say nothing about mutual or ministerial absolution; and I will not here raise the controversy regarding the true interpretation of those words of our Lord, which have been taken as the foundation of this ecclesiastical practice. But I cannot but stop a while at these singular last-recorded events of Hooker's life; and while I think of the views of this his chosen friend, which Archdeacon Denison has given to the world, I am constrained by my surprise as it were to stand and wonder! Hooker's own teaching on the Lord's supper is with a few other reserved for the "ampler æther" which the Third Part will afford. But giving every possible degree of favourable interpretation to Dr Saravia's character, at least in the later part of his life, one is yet driven to say that this treatise is not what one would have expected from the intimate associate and bosom friend of such an one as we Englishmen love to see in Hooker. If Saravia put forward views like these—and one would not suspect him of hiding them—one would have supposed that they would cast a cloud upon the intercourse, and put an end to the fraternal feeling which requires that hearts should be "of each other sure." The life of Saravia is soon narrated. He was born in Artois, and was a minister and professor at Leyden, where he was educated. He left it for England under

suspicion of being involved in a plot for surrendering it to Robert of Leicester; and it is certain that he was made Prebendary of Canterbury; and it seems that he retained it till he died. He was one of the board appointed in 1607 to translate the Bible. His name stands third after Andrewes and Overall in one of the committees. A change of opinion upon the orders of ministers seems to have occasioned unpleasantness between him and some early friends; but it is a matter of far less weight than what we are bound to put into the scale—his published opinions in this volume on the Lord's supper.

P. 108. "In the sacrament of the eucharist it is not the signification of the body and blood that alone sanctifies the sacrament, but the presence of (Christ) Himself.

P. 106. "They are not to be heard who in their disputation assert that Christ's body and blood are in the sacrament of the eucharist only in a sign. Sanctity is not brought to pass by signification only; for the sacred sign testifies the presence of the things signified. [Mere assertion with not ever so thin a stratum of argument under it.] He that takes it away takes away also the sanctity of the sacrament.

P. 94. "And I think it a consequence from this, that Christ's true body and blood are sacramentally given and received by hypocrites. [A direct denial of the article which says "*in no wise* are they (the wicked) partakers of Christ. Substitute for "sacramentally" its true meaning "in or as by a sacred sign," and this part of his assertion is in antagonism with the word "true" as he means to use that word.] I am not a whit moved by the alterations of the theologians that cry out that our Saviour's words

*On the Holy Eucharist, p. 108. London, 1855.*

In sacramento eucharistiæ significatio sola corporis et sanguinis Salvatoris nostri non sanctificat sacramentum sed Ipsius præsentia.

P. 106.

Non sunt audiendi qui in eucharistiæ sacramento Christi carnem et sanguinem tantum esse in signo disputant. Significatione solâ non perficitur sanctitas: testatur enim rei significatione sanctum præsentiam signum. Qui eam tollit simul etiam sacramenti sanctitatem tollit.

P. 94.

Unde ego consequens arbitror tradi et percipi ab hypocritis sacramentaliter verum corpus et verum sanguinem Christi. Nihil me movent altercationes theologorum clamantium verba Servatoris nostri docere

teach the contrary when He says, 'He that eats My flesh, &c., has eternal life.'

P. 100. "To me indeed it does not appear more absurd that Christ's flesh is truly eaten in the sacrament by a person who is not pious, than that the ark of God could be handled and carried by the impious sons of Eli. [The parallel would be with bad officiating ministers, but he means that the body of Christ is eaten by bad and good bodily.]

P. 116. "I shall not allow that by the Lord's bread Augustine understood that Judas received only sacramental bread without the Lord's body, since he in many places fully affirms that he (Judas) ate the Lord's body and drank His blood with the rest of the apostles. [Judas eating it destroys many theories.]

P. 120. "It is false in my judgment absolutely to deny that the wicked and hypocrites eat the Lord's flesh or drink His blood, because [confessedly] they do it not in a spiritual way or with sincere faith. [Dr Saravia is a singular professor of adherence to the Articles of the Church of England: see Art. XXIX. on this point. It will be perceived that he as some others is shut up to hold three eatings: (1) one of the bread and wine, (2) another feeding spiritually and by faith on Divine grace signified, (3) and a third, the real eating of Christ's natural body. And he affirms that the wicked eat in senses (1) and (3), and the believing in senses (1) (2) and (3); so that Christ's real natural body is eaten both by the bad and by the good.]

P. 22. "The sacrament of the eucharist may be defined as follows, that it is a communication of the body of our Lord Jesus

---

contrarium, quando ait, "Qui edit carnem Meam, &c., habet vitam æternam."

P. 100.

Mihi vero non magis absurdum videtur, carnem Christi ab impio vere in sacramento manducari, quam ab impiis Eli filiis Dei arcam attractari et bajulari potuisse, &c.

P. 116.

Non concedam per "panem Domini" Augustinum intellexisse tantum panem sacramentalem *sine corpore* Domini Judam accepisse, quum pluribus in locis (Augustinus) diserte affirmet illum cum cæteris apostolis *edissee corpus et bibisse sanguinem Domini*.

P. 120.

Male, meo judicio, absolute negatur impios et hypocritas manducare carnem vel bibere sanguinem Domini, quia spiritualiter et siucera fide id non faciunt.

P. 22.

Potest eucharistiæ sacramentum hoc modo definiri, quod sit, sub specie panis et vini, corporis Domini nostri Jesu Christi pro nobis in ara

Christ once offered for us on the altar of the cross, and of the blood of the new testament shed for the remission of sins, under the form of bread and wine, and a commemoration of His death...The third thing that I would have marked is the remission of sins and eternal life, which is the virtue of the sacrament distinct from those two parts of the sacrament [*i.e.* first the elements and then second Christ's body and blood]. For those three things are to be considered distinct from one another in any sacrament: the outward visible sign and the thing unseen and Heavenly, sacramentally united to the sign; and the third, that which emanates from them the fruit of the sacrament. [The Church of England says there are but two. His middle part is the sacramental eating of Christ's real natural body.]

P. 24. "The Romanists in this sacrament subtract the bread and wine, and leave us empty appearances of bread and wine without the substance of them...Since therefore these parts of the sacrament of the Lord's supper are essential, the bread and the body of Christ, the wine and the blood of Christ cannot be separated from one another, nor be understood in a separated state. [Whether Saravia is an ally preparing the way for Papal doctrine has to be considered, but that he is cutting and slashing in the Church of England garden is most evident. He seems now dropping into consubstantiation in the sense of our receiving both substances and the accidents of both together, *i.e.* complete double signs and the complete *res ipsæ*, Christ's body and blood.]

P. 16. "I could wish that as many as shall handle this argument henceforth, should make no proposal in opposition to the pacification arrived at in Wittenberg in the year 1536, or to the confession of the princes of Germany at Strasbourg. For I trust

---

*crucis semel oblatis et sanguinis novi Testamenti in remissionem peccatorum fusi communicatio, mortisque Ipsius commemoratio...Tertium quod notare cupio est peccatorum remissio et vita æterna, quæ virtus est sacramenti, distincta ab illis duabus sacramenti partibus. Tria enim in quovis sacramento ab invicem distincta sunt consideranda; externum visibile signum; et res invisibilis cœlestisque signo sacramentaliter unita; et tertium, quod ab eis manat, sacramenti fructus.*

P. 24.

Romanistæ in hoc sacramento panem et vinum subtrahunt, et inania simulacra panis et vini absque suâ substantiâ nobis relinquunt, &c.... Quum igitur istæ partes sacramenti cœnæ Domini sint essentielles, panis et corpus Christi, vinum et Ipsius sanguis, ab invicem non possunt separari nec separatæ intelligi.

P. 16.

Optarem quotquot posthac hoc argumentum tractabunt *nihil movere* quod adversetur pacificationi factæ, anno 1536, Wittenburgæ, aut principum Germaniæ confessioni Augustanæ. Hoc enim pacto dissidium de

that difference upon the matter of the sacrament can by this agreement be abolished, and Christ's churches which in Europe are dispersed, as sheep among wolves, can be united and allied.

P. 120. "The pious consent in this matter of those servants of God, whom God has in these last times stirred up to restore the purity of Christian doctrine with the ancient fathers, makes me dwell longer on this argument. [He quotes Bucer and Luther, and then the Wittenberg agreement. See Seckendorff, Hist. Luth. III. 122.] We have heard them make these declarations. They confess that there are two things...Therefore they think and teach that Christ's body and blood are truly and essentially present with the bread and wine, and are received (with them)...They confess and think that by the sacramental union the bread is Christ's body; i.e. they think and believe that when the bread is delivered, Christ's body is at the same time present and is truly delivered [The word is 'reached forth.'] and received...Wherefore as Paul says that even the unworthy eat the sacrament, so they think that Christ's body and blood are truly supplied to the unworthy also, and that the unworthy truly receive them, when the institution and the command are kept. [This is curious teaching for Hooker's bosom friend. It is not that which the Church of England adopted.]

P. 18. "We must at length come back to this, that Christ the Lord in true reality delivered His own body and blood to His own disciples in the supper. But the mode in which that was done surpasses human apprehension. [So says Bellarmine.]

re sacramentariâ aboleri, et uniri ac consociari Christi ecclesias, quæ per Europam tamquam oves sunt inter lupos dispersæ, posse confido, &c.

P. 120.

Pius consensus in hac re servorum Dei, quos Deus postremis his temporibus excitavit ad restituendam puritatem Christianæ doctrinæ cum priscis patribus, facit ut diutius huic immerer argumento. Audivimus, &c., hoc modo declarare. Fatentur...duas esse res...Sentiunt igitur et docent cum pane et vino *verè* et essentialiter præsens adesse exhiberi et sumi corpus et sanguinem Christi...fatentur et sentiunt sacramentali unione panem esse corpus Christi: hoc est sentiunt et credunt, porrecto pane, simul præsens esse et *verè* porrigi corpus Christi...Quare, sicut Paulus dicit etiam indignos sacramentum manducare, *ita* sentiunt etiam indignis *verè* exhiberi corpus et sanguinem Christi et *indignos verè accipere*, cum institutio et mandatum servantur, &c.

P. 18.

Huc tandem redeundum est, Christum Dominum tradidisse *revera* in cenâ Suâ corpus et sanguinem Suum discipulis Suis. Modus autem, quo id factum est, superat humanum captum.

P. 26. "For the bread, made the sacrament [sacred sign] of Christ's body, has relation to the body and the wine to the blood by Divine institution, so that he, that has the bread, certainly and truly has the body, and he that has the wine has the blood; but not absolutely and simply, as they [the body and blood] are now in dimension locally in one spot in Heaven, but in a resemblance, by a certain necessary relation to body and blood, and by a sacramental union. [This Dr Saravia is a juggler with words. What body at Leyden educated him? Louvain or Douai would have seemed natural.] The mode of the presence of Christ's body in Heaven is different from the mode of His presence in the sacrament.

P. 32. "The only controversy seems to be that which relates to the mode of the presence.

P. 126 begins a whole sermon, by Edward Fox, Bishop of Hereford.

P. 142. "Dr E. Fox. There is, says he, a dissension rather in relation to the mode of the presence or absence, than in relation to the presence or absence itself. For no one is so obtuse as to assert that Christ's body is present or absent in all modes. [Very adroit indeed.]

P. 158. After quoting Gregory, "Therefore in my judgment it is wrong in some to deny that Christ's body and blood can be eaten and drunken by the bodily mouth.

P. 168. "The following argument would not avail with Paul. This food and drink is spiritual: therefore it cannot be eaten and

P. 26.

Nam panis, factus corporis Christi sacramentum, relationem habet ad corpus, et vinum ad sanguinem ex institutione Divinâ, ita ut, qui panem habet, habeat *certo et vere* corpus et, qui vinum, sanguinem: *non autem* absolute et simpliciter, *sicut illa localiter nunc in uno cœli loco sunt dimensa*, sed in typo, quâdam ad corpus et sanguinem necessariâ relatione et sacramentali unione. Alius præsentiæ corporis Christi modus in cœlo; *alius in sacramento*.

P. 32.

De præsentiæ modo solo videtur esse controversia.

P. 142.

Dissidium (inquit) magis est de modo præsentiæ vel absentiæ, quam de ipsâ præsentiâ vel absentiâ. Nemo enim tam obtusus est qui asserat omnibus modis adesse vel abesse Christi corpus.

P. 158.

Non recte igitur meo iudicio a nonnullis negatur ore corporis corpus et sanguinem Christi manducari et bibi.

P. 168.

Apud Paulum hæc argumentatio non valeret. Hic cibus et potus est spiritualis; ergo non potest ore corporeo edi et bibi. Omnia sacra-



drunk with the bodily mouth. All sacraments as well of the old as of the new covenant are spiritual things, of which the pious have with faith made good use, and the wicked bad use without faith. [This shews that spiritually often does not mean with faith in a spirit of life, but things with a spiritual meaning, *i.e.* for the soul not for the body only. In this sense Christ's body eaten by a wicked man would be a spiritual eating.]

P. 172. "A bodily and a spiritual eating are not contrary things.

P. 174. "A memory is celebrated, but *not* of an absent Christ, who (on the contrary) is with us until the world's consummation. How, you will say, is that done?...I can make no answer but that which has been made before this by other pious and learned men; *viz.* by a Heavenly, a supernatural, a spiritual, and I say it, by that Divine mode, by which the Lord fits us into Himself as His own members. [This is less straightforward than what he said before, *viz.* that it is by a bodily though not a natural bodily mode of presence; see extracts from Bp. Thirlwall. No one with greater boldness than Saravia asserts that our bodies are united and made one with Christ's body by some bodily mode.]

P. 168. "This difference exists between the good and the bad—the believing and the unbelieving, that the former ate and drank with the bodily mouth and spiritually by faith; but the latter only with the bodily mouth and without faith.

P. 166. "Let Christian ears have done with hearing that assertion, 'A Christian cannot with the bodily mouth spiritually 'eat Christ's flesh and drink His blood.' [Not consistent with the triple distinction made before, nor with itself.]

menta tam veteris quam novi testamenti sunt res spirituales, quibus pii fide bene usi sunt, et impii male sine fide.

P. 172.

Corporea et spiritualis manducatio non sunt res contrariæ.

P. 174.

Celebratur memoria, sed non absentis Christi, Qui nobiscum est usque ad consummationem sæculi. Quomodo (inquies) id fit... Nihil habeo quod respondeam quam quod ab aliis piis et doctis viris responsum est prius; nempe cælesti, supernaturali, spirituali, et Divino illo (inquam) modo, quo nos in membra Sua Dominus Sibi coaptat, &c.

P. 168.

Discrimen hoc intercessit inter bonos et malos, fideles et incredulos, quod illi ore corporeo et spiritualiter per fidem ederunt et biberunt, hi vero tantum ore corporeo, et sine fide.

P. 166.

Facessat igitur a Christianis auribus "Ore corporeo carnem Christi "edere et sanguinem Ejus bibere spiritualiter Christianus nequit."

P. 164. "This is a new theology, that sacraments cannot be received spiritually with the body or with the bodily mouth. [It is as if the writer were designing to produce confusion.]

P. 46. "The outward signs of Christ [point] to crucified flesh and to blood shed and dropping from Christ's wounds, &c. The sacrament of the eucharist has neither likeness nor signification, nor any shewing forth of Christ's glorious body... That happy state [of Christ's body in Heaven] has nothing in common with the symbols of Christ's crucified body. [This verges upon Dr Vogan's ideas.]

P. 40. "It refers not to flesh simply, such as it is in glory, but such as it was on the altar of the cross; in like manner the wine also refers to blood, not that which now is in the Lord's glorified body, but that which was flowing from the wounds of the Lord's body. Otherwise how would that be true, 'As often as we eat this bread and drink this cup we declare the Lord's death till 'He come'?

P. 26. "There is a disputation regarding the true and real presence of the Lord's body and blood in this sacrament, *viz.* that it cannot be supplied in many places at the same time, because this is contrary to the mode and nature of a true body, which is locally circumscribed in its own dimensions, and that if you take them away from it, you at the same time take away the bodily

P. 164.

Nova theologia hæc est, sacramenta non posse spiritualiter recipi corpore vel corporeo ore.

P. 46.

Externa Christi symbola ad carnem crucifixam et ad sanguinem fusum et manantem e Christi vulneribus, &c. Sacramentum eucharistiæ nec imaginem nec significationem nec ullam exhibitionem habet corporis Christi gloriosi... Conditio illa beata nihil habet commune cum symbolis crucifixi corporis Christi, &c.

P. 40.

Non referri ad carnem simpliciter qualis est in gloriâ sed qualis fuit in arâ crucis, similiter et vinum referri ad sanguinem, non eum qui nunc est in glorificato Domini corpore sed fluentem e vulneribus corporis Domini. Alias, quomodo verum esset, "Quoties manducamus hunc panem et poculum bibimus nos annunciare mortem Domini donec veniat"?

P. 26.

Disputatur de verâ et reali corporis et sanguinis Domini in hoc sacramento præsentia—illam pluribus in locis simul non posse exhiberi, quia hoc sit contra veri corporis modum et naturam, quod localiter suis dimensionibus est circumscriptum, cui si illas adimis, naturam corporis

nature. But this answer is made...That He, Who is God and created all things out of nothing, can place Himself in presence in His own body in many places, wherever He will, by a supernatural and Divine mode. It is indeed determined that by the order of nature that cannot be, but by Divine power that overcomes all the order of nature. Divine mysteries are not to be examined by natural reasonings, &c. (Christ appeared after His ascension to Paul, and God appeared of old, &c. &c.). In these thoughts about Christ's presence in many places I see nothing impious." [What did Saravia in the Church of England ?]

---

simul adimis. Sed respondetur... Illum, Qui Deus est et omnia creavit ex nihilo, præsentem Suo corpore pluribus in locis—ubicunque volet modo supernaturali ac Divino Se sistere posse. [The word "non" in the text is an error.] Ordine quidem naturæ id non fieri certum est, sed potentiâ Divinâ, quæ superat omnem naturæ ordinem. Mystera Divina non sunt physicis rationibus examinanda, &c. Then the appearance of Christ on earth to Paul and those of God in the Old Testament are reasoned from, and it is concluded: In his cogitationibus de præsentia corporis Christi in pluribus locis ... nullam impietatem video, &c.

(R.R.) DR JOHN RAINOLDS, PRESIDENT OF C.C.C., OXFORD.

One of the translators of the Bible. B. 1549. D. 1607.

He like Bishop Jewel and Richard Hooker was a native of the fair county of Devon, and went to Corpus Christi at Oxford, of which he became the twin light with William Whitaker, of Cambridge. At C. C. C., where Jewel drew honour from lecturing in Rhetoric, and Hooker from lecturing in Logic, Rainolds completed the triad by lecturing in Greek on the Rhetoric of Aristotle. But a more singular occurrence awaited him, which Fuller compares to the mutual slaughter of Eteocles and Polynices in the play of Æschylus. Rainolds was himself by conviction a Romanist, but he had a brother William, who was equally convinced upon the great Protestant truths. So, as Fuller says, the two brothers contended in argument, each to overpower the other, and strangely both succeeded; as William the Protestant came out of the struggle a thorough adherent of Popery, and John shewed by all his subsequent life that no more thorough or intelligent believer in the truths of genuine Protestantism apart from mere partizanship is to be found. Fuller is somewhat prodigal

of his wit on the singular circumstance, but for once produced 12 lines of good verse in Latin by W. A., ending thus :

victus gaudet uterque

Et simul alteruter se superasse dolet.

Chosen to be respondent to the doctors in July and November of 1589, he chose the subjects of the two triplet theses ; for the 1st, The authority of Scripture is above that of the church ; for the second, Separation from Rome is lawful in the cases of the Reformed churches. Soon came on his conference with the Jesuit Hart, who challenged the university respecting Holy Scripture and faith ; and to fulfil Horace's "nunc in reluctantes dracones" he next assailed Bellarmine's lectures at Rome, answering them point by point as they reached him in packets sent to the English court, *i.e.* as soon as was possible after the delivery of each. Queen Elizabeth, who made the Cambridge luminary, Whitaker, Master of St John's, promoted Rainolds to be Dean of Lincoln. But he returned to Oxford to be near Robinson, the Bishop of Carlisle. He resided at Queen's, where the current belief was, that on whatever subject you wanted special information you might draw it out of John Rainolds as from an ever-flowing well. He was made one of the board appointed by James I. at the instance of the leading Puritans, as it was called to *translate*, but in reality to revise, the Bible ; and as Rainolds' strength decayed, they met at his lodgings ; so that he may be said to have died with his hand on the plough at this holy work, as Bede did in his measure and in his day. Isaac Wake, the public orator, pronounced the eulogy over him in a great public funeral.

*Summe of the Conference between John Rainolds and John Hart.*  
London, 1609.

P. 417. "He (St Dionysius) hath more things than either the church of the apostles had, or ours doth allow ; yet neither all that ye have, and many that ye have not, and some clean contrary to yours : as *viz.* in the sacrament of the Lord's supper, wherein you vary from us most, he neither hath your stage-like gestures and toys, nor invocations of saints, nor adoration of creatures, nor sacrificing of Christ to God, nor praying for the souls in purgatory, nor sole receiving of the priests, nor ministering under one kind to them that receive, nor exhortations, lessons, prayers in a tongue that the people doth not understand. So that in things of substance and not of ceremony he differeth as far from your blas-

phemous mass, as he is near our communion. But the things which he saith, you say that he affirmeth that he learned them of the apostles. He doth so, I grant: as it was fit for him to do, who would be counted the Denys that was converted by St Paul, &c.

P. 467. "The name of 'priest' as it hath relation to sacrifice is 'sacerdos,' which word your Trent fathers do use in handling the sacrifice of the mass. Now because the name of 'sacerdos' is not given to the ministers of the Gospel in the New Testament, your Rhemists make the name that is given them the same with 'sacerdos,' to the intent that the simple, not seeing the slight (the device), may conceive thereby that the ministers of the gospel are priests ordained to sacrifice, and so may loath (loathe) our ministers, which neither do sacrifice nor list to be called priests, and may embrace your priests, who profess themselves to be priests, yea mass-priests, and are sent to sacrifice.

P. 466. "As for your Rhemists, who still translate 'sacerdos' a priest, as granting that we have no other English word for it, and yet translate presbyter by the same word too, they do join together that which God hath severed; and the words which the Holy Ghost doth distinguish they willingly confound.

P. 493. After a long parallel between Popish ceremonies and Jewish rites,

"I doubt not, Mr Hart, that you are persuaded that this kind of service in your church is Christian...But in very truth it is more than Jewish...For although it might be delightful to the flesh—the eyes with galant sights—the ears with pleasant sounds—the nose with fragrant savours—the mind with show of Godliness to him that doth not understand—yet a spiritual man would be grieved at it, as Paul was at Athens, and lament that the people should doat upon that by which they are not edified, and weep over them, as Christ over Jerusalem. 'O if thou hadst known, &c. hidden from thine eyes.' The Lord take away this vail from your heart, if it be His good pleasure, that you may see at length what it is to worship Him in spirit and truth; and may you see it and do it. [Galant is from "gala."]

[The following is needed in this question because the church is by many pleaded as a sufficient authority, apart from the N. T.]

*The Six Theses.*

P. 17. "For when, stirred up by the desire of purging the Protestant church from errors and superstitions, they asked from

*Sex Theses de sacra Sc. et Eccl.* London, 1602. P. 17, § 8.

Nam quum Protestantess ecclesiæ ab erroribus et superstitionibus purgandi studio percitæ a Tridentinâ synodo peterent ut ex sacræ

the Tridentine Synod that controversies should be decided by the judgment of holy Scripture, which the synod of Basle had granted to the Bohemians and the catholic doctors had recognized as necessary to be granted before the synod of Basle was held—the fathers of Trent, having become more sagacious, were unwilling to give so great deference to Scripture alone, but coupled the traditions and decrees of man with the word of God, in the same way altogether as the fathers of the Jews used to urge ‘the traditions of the elders’ and ‘that it was said by them of old time’ on behalf of their own superstitions and errors, affirming also at least that God gave to Moses in the mount Sinai, the Scriptures and the Talmud, or a double law, one written and one not written; as Papists say the apostles received from Christ not only what has been consigned to sacred books, but also the rest of the dogmas, mysteries and sacraments of the Roman church, and as they divide the word of God into Scripture and traditions, or make the one God’s word not written and the other His word written. And in this thing, although all Christian authors have not well observed the fraud of Satan, they have yet exploded the affirmations of the old heretics, who used to pretend that Christ had revealed some things to His apostles in secret to be communicated to the worthy and perfect, and zealously laboured to defend their own comments that were very little supported by Scripture, by such, as it were, apostolic tradition. But who knows whether the Trent Synod would so have expressed her decree regarding the Scriptures and traditions, unless Andradius had made the meaning of the Synod

---

Scripturæ judicio deciderentur controversiæ, quod Bohemis annuerat Basileensis synodus (see note, Sess. 4) et ante synodum Basileensem catholici doctores annuendum agnoverant—prudenciores facti patres Tridentini Scripturæ soli tantum deferre noluerunt; sed cum verbo Dei traditiones et decreta humana copularunt eodem prorsus modo quo patres Judaici “traditiones seniorum” et “dictum esse antiquis” pro superstitionibus erroribusque suis urgebant: etiam Deum tandem affirmantes Mosis dedisse in monte Sinai Scripturas atque Talmud, sive geminam legem alteram scriptam alteram non scriptam: ut Papistæ apostolos a Christo aiunt accepisse non solum quæ sacris literis consignata sunt, sed etiam reliqua dogmata, mysteria, sacramenta, Romanæ ecclesiæ; ac verbum Dei in Scripturam traditionesque partiuntur, seu aliud Dei verbum non scriptum, aliud scriptum faciunt. Quâ in re tametsi autores Christiani non ita fraudem Satana observârunt cuncti: exploserunt tamen veteres hæreticos, qui fingebant Christum apostolis secreto quædam revelâsse communicanda dignis perfectisque, et commenta sua Scripturis minime nixa tueri, quasi traditione apostolicâ, studebant. Quis autem scit an ideo Tridentina synodus decretum de Scripturis et traditionibus sic expresserit, ut videri possit, sicuti Kemnicius notavit (Exam. Concil. Trid.) hoc solum velle, unam et eandem esse doctrinam evangelii, quam apostolicâ primum voce tradiderunt, et

clear, so that it may seem as is noted by Kemnitius, that the Synod's only wish was, that the doctrine of the Gospel was one and the same, as delivered at first by their mouth and as afterwards embraced in the books of the N. T. and that the meaning of the Synod was that not all things that are to be wrought into life and manners, *i.e.* that are required for our souls' salvation, are contained in the Scriptures? [The Synod of Basle has these words,] 'The law of God, the apostolic practice of Christ and of the primitive church, together with the councils and doctors truly founding themselves on the same.' [See Rainolds himself on this.]

P. 155. "Now—a point of which my speech may very heavily complain—the way in which they have violated our mystic rites of life the sacraments, which were instituted by Christ to be seals of grace, and (as was acutely said by Pius V. from the fathers) trickled down from Christ's side, most few in number, most easy to perform, most august to the understanding, most holy to observe, most excellent in meaning, by adding to them several more, and how they have polluted them with a torrent of ceremonies, and in appearance augmented them in efficacy, but in reality diminished them in real power, depraved them by men's fictions and robbed them of their fruit, while they celebrate them in a barbarous speech often not understood even by their own priests. And to pass over how greatly they have dashed baptism to the ground by these defects and inconveniences, though yet the pity of God has preserved its vital force and as it were its soul entire; they have polluted the Lord's holy supper with so many and so profane filthinesses of errors and abuses, that hardly any vestige

---

postea libris complexi sunt, nisi patefecisset Andradius (Orth. Explic. lib. 2) Synodi sensum, non omnia informanda fidei et moribus, *i.e.* animorum salutis necessaria, Scripturis contineri, [I cite this part of the synod of Basle, because its meaning does not seem beyond dispute] "Lex Divina, praxis Christi apostolica, et ecclesiæ primitivæ, una cum conciliis doctoribusque fundantibus se veraciter in eadem."

P. 155, § 35.

Jam, quæ satis graviter conqueratur oratio, quo pacto mysticos vitæ ritus sacramenta, ad obsignandam gratiam a Christo instituta, et (ut Pius V. argute post patres dicit) ex latere Christi manantia, numero paucissima, factu facillima, intellectu augustissima, observatione castissima, significatione præstantissima, violarint adjectione plurium, polluerint ceremoniarum profluvio, efficacitate auxerint in speciem, re ipsâ minuerint, commentis hominum depravarint et spoliarint fructu, dum sermone barbaro nec sacerdotibus suis nonnunquam intellecto celebrant. Quibus noxis incommodisque (ut omittam quantopere affligerint baptismum, cujus tamen vitalem vim et velut animam Divina misericordia integram conservant) sanctam cœnam Domini tot ac tam profanis errorum abusuumque spurcitiis inquinaverunt, ut nullum propemodum

of Christ's institution can be seen in it. For out of a sacrament they have made a sacrifice, not for giving thanks (and of eucharist as they name it) but to work propitiation, and not this as shadowing Christ, but truly propitiatory in its own right, a sacrifice which that little priest may offer, as a new kind of priest after the order of Melchizedek, for the punishments, sins and satisfactions of the dead also and not of the living only; yea and for a man's pig, for his cock, or for anything, which they may commend to God in prayers. That one only sacrifice, by the immolation of which once for all we were redeemed and sanctified for ever, they immolate a thousand times and make Christ's death utterly void. They take away by their real presence the human truth of Christ's nature. They take away by transubstantiation the substance of the sacrament as the sign of a sacred thing. They take away by private masses the use of participation among the pious, excellent as it is and sanctioned by express precept. They take away our Saviour's institute, the singular consolation of the elect, the most sweet testimony of salvation, by the communion under one kind. They take away in a great degree the honour of the Son sitting at the right hand of the Father to intercede for us, as it is in remembrance of Him that this mystery has been ordered to be celebrated, while they celebrate the same on account of the memory and honour of the saints, that they may enjoy the patronage and intercession of these saints themselves in Heaven. Finally they take away I had almost said all religion. Certainly they pollute it by a very profane and sacrilegious pomp, while in processions

---

institutionis Christi vestigium in eâ cerni queat. Nam ex sacramento fecerunt sacrificium, non gratiarum actionis (et eucharistiæ, uti nominant), sed propitiatorium, nec propitiatorium quasi Christum adumbrans, sed vere propriè propitiatorium, quod offerat sacrificulus, tanquam novus sacerdos secundum ordinem Melchisedec, pro mortuorum etiam non solum pro vivorum pœnis peccatis satisfactionibus, immo et pro hominis porco, pro gallinâ, pro qualibet re, quam precibus commendare liceat. Unicam illam Hostiam, quâ semel immolatâ redempti et sanctificati sumus in perpetuum immolant rursum millies et exinaniant mortem Christi. Tollunt humanam naturæ Christi veritatem reali præsentia. Tollunt sacramenti utpote "signi rei sacræ" substantiam transubstantiatione. Tollunt excellentem et præcepto sancitum participationis usum inter pios missis privatis. Tollunt institutum Servatoris nostri, tollunt electorum solatium singulare, tollunt dulcissimum salutis testimonium communione sub unâ specie. Tollunt magnâ ex parte honorem Filii sedentis ad dextram Patris, ut interpellet pro nobis, in cujus memoriam celebrari jussum est hoc mysterium, dum in sanctorum quoque memoriam et honorem propterea idem celebrant, ut ipsorum patrocínio et intercessionem in cœlis potiantur. Denique religionem omnem prope dixerim tollunt. Certe inquinant admodum profanâ et sacrilegâ pompâ, dum in processionibus panem Domini bajulant, ut



they carry the bread with their shoulders, to be adored as if it were God; even before the Roman Pontiff on horseback with lanterns (whether or no this be to give occasion for thinking that Judas Iscariot is in the train behind) in just the way in which in Persia they are wont to carry about the sacred fire before their new king. Nor indeed shall we discover in this a lighter amount of impiety towards God or of iniquity towards men, if we observe what gods and goddesses and what things and for what objects they customarily invoke them. For in the place of God, to Whom alone the sacrifice of invocation and of giving thanks and of praise is due, they implore sainted men and sainted women for the obtaining of grace or glory; for instance, what we are Divinely taught to seek from the Father of lights and compassions, they ask to be given them by the virgin, whom they have also decorated with Divine titles;

Mary, mother of grace,  
Mother of compassion,  
Protect us from the enemy,  
And take us up at the hour of death.

From that most modest virgin, who, were she present and heard that such honour was paid to her, would doubtless be greatly pained as Paul and Barnabas grieved, &c. Saluting in the same way the ointment and Mary, 'Hail holy ointment;' that is, as their own explanation is, entreating joy and peace from it: asking in fine from the wooden image of the cross as from their

adoretur tanquam Deus: etiam ante Romanum pontificem in equo cum laternis (an ut Judam Iscariotem subsequi occasio detur cogitandi?) similiter ac in Perside pagani sacrum ignem ante regem suum circumgestare solebant. Neque vero in precibus leviores eorum aut impietatem erga Deum aut iniquitatem erga homines deprehendimus si observaverimus quos et quas et quæ et pro quibus quemadmodum invocare soleant. Etenim loco Dei, Cui soli sacrificium invocationis et gratiarum actionis sive laudis debetur, sanctos et sanctas pro gratiâ gloriâve obtinendâ implorant; ut exempli causâ, quod a Patre luminum et miserationum Divinitus petere docemur, a virgine, Dei quoque titulis decoratâ, concedi sibi postulant;

Maria, mater gratiæ,  
Mater misericordiæ,  
Tu nos ab hoste protege,  
Et horâ mortis suscipe.

A modestissimâ virgine, quæ, si adesset audiretque honorem sibi talem haberi, sine dubio permolestè ferret, haud secus Paulus et Barnabas doluerunt, &c. &c. Salutantes similiter unguentum et Mariam "Ave sanctum chrisma:" hoc est ut ipsorum explicatio infert, gaudium ac pacem ab eo exposcentes: rogantes demum a lignæ crucis imagine,

own only hope not only grace but an augmentation of it. 'Augment grace to the pious, and grant pardon to the guilty.' [Then follows much more on forgiveness of sins, prayers for the dead, vain repetitions. One would almost think that the ghost of John Rainolds, uttering this one passage, might scare away Roman ritualism from his own Oxford and then go on to Cambridge and in the same way effect the same services.]

P. 349. "Augustin is wickedly brought in by Bellarmine as saying or hinting that the impious are of the flesh of Christ, of His body, of the church, which he openly denies.

P. 258. "And Augustin does not say that all the baptized are made members of Christ's body in any other case than if they are holy and have received the remission of sins. Besides he affirms that wicked men, although they have obtained both sacraments, as well baptism as the Lord's supper, I speak of the sacrament and not the thing in the sacrament, are like bad humours in the body, and not as members of it: so that he eloquently denies that those are to be counted in the body of Christ, who are contrary either to Christ or to a member of Christ, or are without charity. And that again in 1 Cor. xii. 26. Wherefore Stapleton is condemned by his own authors themselves.

P. 361. "Papists, who by the dogma of transubstantiation make Christ bodily present with every one little priest, layman and laywoman, affirm 'that as a man He has ascended into 'Heaven with His body and soul. And surely, if he were conver-

---

*tanquam unicâ suâ spe, non modo gratiam, sed gratiæ incrementum, "Auge piis justitiam, Reisque dona veniam."*

*P. 349.*

Augustinus a Bellarmino nequiter introducitur aïens innuensve impios de carne Christi, de corpore, de ecclesiâ esse; quod aperte negat.

*P. 258.*

Neque aliter membra factos esse corporis Christi cunctos baptizatos ait Augustinus, quam si sancti sint et gratiam remissionis peccatorum acceperint. Præterea homines improbos, quamvis sacramentum utrumque cum baptismi tum eucharistiæ adeptos, sacramentum dico non rem sacramenti, affirmat esse "tanquam humores malos in corpore" (1 Ep. Johan. tract. 3) ac non tanquam membra: usque adeo ut diserte neget "in membra Christi computandos, qui vel Christo vel Christi membro "sint contrarii, aut caritate vacent." Idque rursum ex Paulo, 1 Cor. xii. 26. Quamobrem a suis ipsis autoribus damnatur Stapletonus. [Further passages from Augustin.]

*P. 361.*

Papistæ, qui per dogma transubstantiationis Christum unicuique sacri-  
ficulo, laico, laicæ, præsentem corporaliter faciunt, affirmant "Eum" (Cat.  
Trid. in expos. Symb. Apost.) "ut homo est, in cælum corpore et

'sant with us on earth, all our thought would be fixed in His human aspect and manner of life; and we should be looking at Him, namely as man, for bestowing on us so great benefits, and we should be going after Him with a kind of earthly benevolence: but ascending up to Heaven He has rendered our love spiritual, and has made us venerate and love as God Him whom we now think of as absent.' This confession is catholic [It is from the Trent Catechism on the Apostles Creed] and it wholly destroys the heresy of the Metusiasts (Lat. transubstantiationists). But in the meantime by the judgment of Papists 'Christ's true body, that same which was born of the virgin Mary, sits in Heaven at God's right hand, [*i.e.* Christ the man,] is contained on earth in the sacrament of the eucharist.' So mad and manly is the thrust of the most catholic dart, by which Bellarmine establishes that Honorius' letters [as placed] wholly destroy the monothelite heresy."

---

"animâ ascendisse. De profecto, si versaretur in terris, omnis nostra cogitatio in ipso Hominis aspectu et consuetudine defixa esset, et illum, duntaxat Hominem, spectaremus, qui nos tantis beneficiis afficeret Eumque terrenâ quâdam benevolentia prosequeremur: verum in cælum ascendens amorem nostrum spiritualem reddidit, effecitque, ut, quem nunc absentem cogitamus, Eum veneremur et diligamus ut Deum." Hæc confessio catholica est, et penitus destruit Metusiastarum hæresim: At Papistarum interim iudicio "verum Christi corpus, illud idem, quod natum ex Mariâ virgine, in cœlis ad dexteram Patris sedet," hoc est Christus homo "sacramento eucharistiæ in terris continetur." Adeo amentato et mascule contorto catholicissimo telo confirmat Bellarminus, monothetarum hæresin epistolis Honorii prorsus destrui. [Is not Rainolds great throughout, but here conclusive?]

(SS.) BISHOP LANCELOT ANDREWES OF WINCHESTER.

B. 1555. D. 1626.

Of his many works a large portion appears in the Library of Anglo-Catholic theology. His learning is indisputable. He was of London, and of Pembroke, Cambridge. He passed through various preferments, Cripplegate, Westminster, and Chichester, to his highest place, which he held with the Chapel Royal till his death. The amount of extract here made is a tribute to his high attainments: but does the Book of Common Prayer include his very pronounced doctrine? He was born in the year which saw Ridley and Latimer "suffer."

*Ninety-six sermons. Sn. VI. Of the Holy Ghost.*

London, 1641.

P. 660. "This then is the seal. I add further that it may be rightly called, The seal of our redemption, as [that] whereby the

means of our redemption is *applied to us*. The body and blood; the one broken, the other shed of Him Whom God sealed to that end, even to redeem us.

Sn. XIII. p. 738—9. "On blood and wine both.

Resn. Sn. XVIII. p. 589. "His blood, &c., &c., ran not waste: but divided into two streams, I. into the laver of the new birth (our baptism), applied to us outwardly to take away the spots of our sin. II. The other into the cup of the New Testament in His blood, which (inwardly administered) serveth us to purge and cleanse the conscience from dead works, that so live works may grow up in their place, so to endue us with the Spirit that shall enable us with power to bring them forth. 'These are the twin (gemina) sacraments' of the church. These are (not two of the sacraments, but) the two twin sacraments of the church, saith St Augustin, 'and with us there are two rules (1) 'Quicquid sacrificio offertur. sacramento confertur,' What the sacrifice offereth, that the sacrament obtaineth. (2) The other, 'Quicquid testamento legatur sacramento dispensatur.' What the testament bequeatheth, that is dispensed in the holy mysteries. To draw to an end—if such power be in the Spirit, and the blood be *the vehiculum of the Spirit*, how may we partake of this blood? It shall be offered you straight in 'the cup of blessing, which we bless' in His name: for 'Is not the cup of blessing which we bless the communion of the 'blood of Christ?' (saith St Paul). Is there any doubt of that? *In which blood of Christ is the Spirit of Christ*. In which Spirit is all spiritual power, that frameth us fit to the works of the Spirit, which Spirit we are all made to drink of.

Ash-Wednesday. Sermon v. p. 218. "We are to offer our bodies as well as our souls, both a sacrifice to God. As our soul by devotion, *so our body by mortification*. And these three to offer to God; our soul by prayer, our body by abstinence, our goods by almsdeeds, have ever been counted *tergemina hostia, the triple or threefold Christian holocaust* or whole burnt-offering.

Resn. Sn. VII. p. 451. On Peace offerings. "Part God had, and part the offerer ate in token of perfect reconciliation between them. Christ's blood, not only in the bason for baptism, but in the cup for the other sacrament. A sacrifice; so to be slain: and propitiatory sacrifice; so to be eaten.

P. 452. "The flesh, our peace-offering, must be eaten in this feast by us: else we evacuate the offering entirely and lose the fruit of it. Was there ever a passover heard of and the lamb not eaten?

P. 454. "By the incomprehensible act of His eternal Spirit not He alone, but He at the very act of His offering is made present to us, and we incorporate into His death and invested into

the benefits of it. If an host could be turned into Him, more glorified as He is, it would not serve. Christ offered is it. Thither we must look. To the Spirit lift up. Thither we must repair, even ad cadaver [*i.e.* to the corpse.] We must hoc facere. Do it. It is then done. So and no otherwise is this epulari [to keep the feast] to be conceived. [On leaven see p. 455, 6.]

Sn. vi. Nativity, p. 52. On the word and "sacrament." "He that eats My flesh abides in Me and I in him. If it be grace and truth we respect, how may we both establish our hearts with *grace*, or settle our minds in the *truth* of His promise than by partaking these, *the conduit-pipes* of His grace, and seals of His truth unto us. Grace and truth now proceeding not from the word alone but *even from the flesh* thereto united, *the fountain of the Word flowing into the cistern of His flesh*, and *from thence* deriving down to us this grace and truth to them that partake Him aright ... for judge with yourselves how inconvenient it is to keep a feast in honour of His taking flesh and even that day abandon His flesh and never once take it ... Accordingly then as well by the act to testify and represent the Word's taking flesh as to procure He may dwell in us, and, dwelling, replenish us with His grace and blood. ... A table of the principal contents. The eucharist *the conduit-pipe of grace and seal of truth*.

P. 42. "God hath offered Him to us this day that He was born for us. So we *reciprocally* this day that He is born *offer Him again to God* ... And when the time cometh of His death, *offer Him* as on the cross slain for our evening sacrifice.

P. 128. "That the great mystery of godliness, which is God manifested in the flesh, might not be celebrated without the mystery of His flesh: that the day He came among us to be partaker of flesh and blood we also might be partakers of the flesh and blood which *He took from us to give them to us again*.

P. 572. "Out ran blood and water both, &c. Out of these pressures ran the blood of the grapes of the true vine; the fruit whereof (Judges ix.) cheereth God and man: God, as a libamen or drink-offering to Him. Man, as the cup of salvation to them."

Andrewes stands almost alone. Perhaps Mede and he come nearest. Without exhibiting any tenderness toward the Church of Rome he magnifies the sacrament of the Lord's supper as the means of grace, the pipe and conduit through which grace flows. It seems to us astonishing that one of so thoughtful a mind did not ask the simple question, Why is it so passed over in the epistles—there being no indubitable and I believe not one real reference to it outside the first Epistle to the Corinthians? I think

the same may be argued out regarding the Acts, as I think the arguments against our interpreting "breaking bread" of the Lord's supper unanswerable. How is it that this history and these letters and the Apocalypse were so written, if any approximating to Andrewes' view of the Lord's supper as the conduit of grace is true? This argument is strengthened by a review of the first three centuries. How gradual the rising of man's superstitious Judaizing tendency! Compare the growth attained in the first three centuries with the gourd-like development in the great fourth century. Cyprian is the only one of the first three centuries, whose sacramental doctrines are at all on a level with those of the fourth. But if Andrewes be right it ought to appear and shine out in them all, and most in those that are nearest to the apostles. What a contrast between this author and the preceding!

(TT.) THE REV. HENRY SMITH, READER OF ST CLEMENT DANES.  
B. 1560. D. 1591.

"Silver-tongued Smith," of Lincoln College, Oxford: admired and promoted by the great Lord Burleigh.

*Treatise of the Lord's Supper, Vol. I.* Edinburgh, 1866.

P. 43. "Christ hath not instituted this sacrament for a fashion in His church; to touch and feel and see, as we gaze on pictures in the windows; but, as the woman, which had the bloody issue, touching the hem of Christ's garment, drew virtue from Christ Himself, because she believed, Matt. ix. 22, so Christ would that we, touching these signs, should draw virtue from Himself: *i.e.* all the graces which these signs represent.

P. 46. "Here is the fruit of His thanks before. He prayed that the bread and wine might be blessed, and they were blessed. As Isaac's blessing shewed itself upon Jacob whom he blessed, Gen. xxvii., so Christ's blessing appeared straight upon these mysteries: for it could not be said before 'This is My body,' because it was mere bread; but now it may be called His body because His blessing hath infused that virtue into it that it doth not only represent His body, but convey His body and Himself into us. [N.B. This is a notable instance of the danger of going one step beyond the two metaphorical meanings, which Holy Writ teaches, *viz.* (1) the slaying of Christ for us and (2) our feeding on Christ in the way of grace from Him. For could a Papist opponent desire much beyond the admission that the bread and

wine, because they are blessed, convey Christ's body unto us? But now see p. 49.] If Christ's very body were offered in the sacrament, then it were not a sacrament but a sacrifice; which two differ as much as giving and taking: for in a sacrifice we give and in a sacrament we receive. [N.B. Thus the peace-offerings were (1) sacrifices in being slain as given to God, and afterwards sacraments, as received and fed upon by the people. An important distinction, I think.]

"Every sacrifice was offered upon the altar. Now mark the wisdom of the Holy Ghost. Lest we should take this for a sacrifice, He never names altar when He speaks of it, but 'the table of the Lord.'

"If the bread were Christ's flesh and the wine His blood... Christ's flesh should be separate from His blood. But His body is not divided; for then it were a dead body.

Paul saith 'They which receive unworthily receive to their 'own damnation' [judgment, *κρίμα*]. But, if it were the flesh of Christ, they should rather receive salvation than damnation [judgment] because Christ saith 'He that eateth My flesh and drinketh 'My blood hath life everlasting,' John vi. 54. [N.B. A most cogent argument against the presence of Christ's body "in with or "under the form, &c."] [One instance in Sophocles is *κρίμα*.]

"The Scripture on the one side and the fathers on the other side did so trouble three arch-papists, Biel, Tonstall and Fisher, that Gabriel Biel saith, How the body of Christ is in the sacrament is not found in the canon of the Bible (Lect. XI.). Tonstall saith, It had been better to leave every man to his own conjecture as they were before the council of the Lateran. [P. 46.] Fisher saith, No man can prove by the words of the Gospel that any priest in these days doth consecrate the very body and blood of Christ. [Against Cap. in Bab. of Luther.]

"The Jews said 'Shew us a miracle.'... A miracle may be seen: but here no miracle is seen.

P. 55. "A body cannot eat spiritually. No more than the soul can eat corporally."

(UU.) JOHN FOX, PREBENDARY OF SALISBURY. Magd. Coll., Oxon.  
B. 1517. D. 1587.

He is the glory of Boston with its tall straight tower: and his work has been as noted and as high a seamark to succeeding generations. From Brazenose he passed to a fellowship at the towered Magdalene, which so well announces to the visitant from

the metropolis that he is entering no mean city. It is interesting to hear that he was tutor to the children of the liberal Earl of Surrey, to whom Scott has raised so affecting a memorial in Fitzraver's song in his first great poem. He too suffered for his opinions and in exile corrected the press in Basle. He returned with the new dawn of Elizabeth's reign and became Prebendary of Salisbury: nor was it through neglect of his friends that he was not raised to the episcopate. However his work remains. Its first sketch was in Latin, a single 8vo. volume, which saw the light at Strasburg, then as now a German city. It began with the days of Wycliff and was completed in a brief manner to his own time. No one can have at all extensively consulted it without coming upon its historical defects: but it was a work compiled with great care and by the aid of others, so that possibly a better could not at that time have been made, and Bishop Grindal compiled materials for part of it. His fidelity is undoubted; for none ever charged him with fiction or willing exaggeration. His work is after all invaluable: and without a rival it has remained to this day. My edition is in 3 vols., roman type, London, 1684. I have selected a little from it to give some specimens of the language of his contemporary martyrs on the Lord's supper.

Vol. I. p. 587. Reign Henry IV. *Sir William Chatris* or *Sautre*, P. P. of St Scythe the Virgin, London, 1400, Saturday, Feb. 12, brought before the Provincial Council under Archbishop Arundel; charged by Chancellor. 8th, That after the pronouncing of the sacramental words of the body of Christ the bread remaineth of the same nature that it was before, neither doth it cease to be bread. Friday, 18th. I, William Sautre, &c., &c., touching the interrogation of the sacrament of the altar, I say that after the pronouncing of the sacramental words of the body of Christ there ceaseth not to be very bread simply; but remains bread holy and true, the very bread of life: and I believe the said sacrament to be *the very body of Christ* after the pronouncing of the sacramental words. [Then they might have acquitted as they might have acquitted John Huss.] Degraded step by step to a "secular layman." Was delivered to the secular prison and burned by decree of the King "the first burned of all them of Wycliff's time." He took the title "Sir" as a preacher. It was equal to the French "Sire," *father*. John Badby (Taylor), March, 1409, said of the institution, It could not sink into his mind that the words are to be taken as they literally lie ... that if every host consecrated in England were the Lord's body, then there would be 20,000 gods



in England. March 14. The Prior of St Bartholomew in Smithfield brought with all solemnity the sacrament of God's body with 12 torches borne before and shewed, &c., demanded, &c. He answered, He knew well it was hallowed bread and not the Lord's body. Then was the tun put over him, and fire put into him, &c., &c.

P. 609. *Thomas Thorpe*. "The fiend was loosed by Friar Thomas again, especially calling the most worshipful sacrament of Christ's own body *an accident without a subject*; but I utterly deny to make this friar's sentence my belief. *The Archbishop*. Well. Thou shalt say otherwise ere that I leave thee. After the consecration abideth there bread or not?

Vol. II. p. 8, 1518, Henry VIII. *Thomas Man* (1) That he had spoken against auricular confession and denied the corporal presence of Christ's body in the sacrament of the altar.

P. 110. Five students at Lyons from Lausanne University, going home of school, martyred. "The verb 'est' in Hoc est corpus Meum is not to be taken here substantively in its own proper signification, &c., but as noting the property of a thing, signifying, &c. *The Black Friar*. The sacraments of the old law and of the new differ greatly; *for these give grace*, but not the other. *Ans*. 'Neither the sacraments of the old law nor of the 'new law *do give grace*, but *shew Him unto us, which giveth grace 'indeed*. The minister giveth the sacraments; but Jesus giveth 'grace by the Holy Ghost, of Whom it is said, This is He that 'baptizeth in the Holy Ghost."

P. 117. 1554. *Richard Feurus*, a goldsmith at Lyons, martyr. "The sacrament of the supper I believe to be ordained of the Lord for a memorial of His death and for a stirring up of our thanksgiving to Him. In which sacrament we have *nothing to offer up to Him*, but do receive with all thanksgiving the benefits offered of God to us most abundantly in Christ Jesus His Son.... *John Lambert's address to Henry VIII*. Christ's holy and natural body is so assumpt into Heaven, that there it must remain all whole, without returning, unto the day of general doom.

Vol. III. p. 26. *Feckenham (Howman) and Lady Jane Grey. Lady*. "I think that I neither receive flesh nor blood, but bread and wine; which bread when it is broken, and wine when it is drunken, putteth me in remembrance how that for my sins the body of Christ was broken and the blood shed on the cross, and with that bread and wine I receive the benefits that came by breaking His body and shedding His blood. God forbid that I should say that I eat the very natural body and blood of Christ... else there were two bodies, two Christa. One body was tormented on the cross; and if they did eat another body, then had He two bodies.

If God would have done any miracle at His supper, He might have done so. But I say He minded no work or miracle, but only to break His body and shed His blood on the cross for our sins. But I pray you to answer me this one question, Where was Christ when He said, This is My body? and what took He but bread? What brake He but bread? and look what He brake He gave: and look what He gave they did eat: and yet all this while He Himself was alive and at supper before His disciples or else they were deceived. If the church be a good church, then the faith of the church must be tried by God's word, and not God's word by the church: either yet (is) my faith: Shall I believe the church because of antiquity?... I pray God to send you His holy Spirit. *To her father.* To me there is nothing that can be more welcome than from this vale of misery to aspire to that heavenly throne of all joy and pleasure, which is with Jesus Christ our Saviour. *To Mr Harding,* late Chaplain to the Duke of Suffolk, fallen from the faith. Wilt thou take upon thee to offer any sacrifice to God for our sins, seeing that Christ offered up Himself, as St Paul saith, upon the cross, a lively sacrifice, once for all? Can neither the punishment of the Israelites (which for their idolatry they suffered), nor the terrible threatenings of the prophets, nor the curses of God's own mouth fear thee [make thee afraid] to honour any other God but Him? Dost thou so regard Him that spared not His own Son for thee, so diminishing, yea utterly extinguishing His glory, that thou wilt attribute the praise and honour due unto Him *to the idols*, which have mouths and speak not, eyes and see not, ears and hear not—which shall perish with them that made them [the figure, Christ on the cross, stamped on the wafer]? Christ offered Himself up once for all; and wilt thou offer Him daily at thy pleasure? But thou wilt say thou doest it for a good intent, &c. Wilt thou for a good intent pluck Christ out of heaven, and make His death void, and deface the triumph of His cross, by offering Him up daily? Wilt thou either for fear of death, &c., hope of life, deny and refuse thy God, who enriched thy poverty, healed thy infirmity, and yielded to thee His victory, if thou wouldest have kept it? And yet let the two-edged sword of God's holy word shear asunder the sinews of worldly respects. Fight manfully, come life, come death. The quarrel is God's, and undoubtedly the victory is ours...

Vol. III. p. 69. *Weston.* "I am a priest, and my vocation is to offer. *Latimer.* Where have you that authority given you to offer? *W.* Hoc facite. *L.* Is facere then nothing but sacrificere to sacrifice? Why then—no man must receive the sacrament but priests only. For there may none offer but priests. Ergo, there may none receive but priests... *W.* Forty year ago where could you have gone to have found your doctrine? *L.* The more cause have we to thank God that hath now sent that into the world.

P. 101. *John Rogers*. "I answered ... I cannot understand *really and substantially* to signify otherwise than corporally. But corporally Christ is only in heaven; and so cannot Christ be, corporally, also in your sacraments.

P. 123. "Then asked Winchester of M. Hooper, what authority moved him not to receive the corporal presence. He said, the authority of God's word: and he alleged the text 'Whom the 'heaven must receive until, &c.' Then the Bishop of W. would have made that that text served nothing for his purpose, and he said that He might be in heaven and in the sacrament also.

P. 139. "Thou [Dr Taylor] sayest well, quoth the Bishop (Gardiner of Winchester); it (the sacrament) is all this and more too, for it is a propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and the dead. Then answered Dr T., This sacrifice did Christ offer once for all: neither can any priest any more offer Him, nor need we any more propitiatory sacrifice: and therefore I say with Chrysostom and all the doctors, Our sacrifice is only memorative, &c.; and other sacrifice hath the church of God none.

P. 162. *Thomas Causton*. "This holy supper is sore abused... 4thly, In that it is worshipped contrary to the commandment 'Thou shalt worship nothing that is made with hands'... And St Paul, 'As often as, &c., till He come.' Here is no change but bread still.

P. 207. *John Warne*. "And I believe that God hath appointed the eating and drinking of the creatures of bread and wine in His holy supper according to His word, to *move and stir up my mind to believe* in the articles above written.

P. 214. "No more bread but the very body and blood ... Did not Christ say, Take eat, this is My body? *Haukes*. It followeth not that the sacrament of the altar is so as you teach. *B*. Why the catholic church taught so; and they were of Christ's church. *H*. How prove you it? The apostles taught not so. Read the Acts, the iind and the xxth. Neither Peter nor Paul ever taught it nor instituted it. *B*. Ah Sir. Ye will have nothing more than the Scripture teacheth; *but even as Christ hath left it bare*.

P. 308. *Miller*, P. P. of Canterbury, brought against Parson Bland of Attesham, says, "We eat Christ's flesh and blood spiritually, when we receive it with faith and charity; and we also do eat it corporally in the sacrament; and the body that we so receive *hath life*: for the Godhead is annexed thereto: which although *it be received with the body of Christ*, yet it is not visible after a gross sort. And the flesh of Christ that we receive is lively, for it hath the Spirit of God joined to it. [This parish priest has been reading and receiving Cyril, on St John.] And if a man be drunken, it is not by receiving the blood of Christ, for it is con-

trary to the nature of Christ's blood. If he be drunken, it is *by the qualities and quantities without the substance* of blood.

P. 311. *Nicholas Sheterden*. "By Himself purged our sins.' This word 'by Himself' hath a vehemency and pith, that driveth all priests from authority to enterprise such oblation; whereas what He Himself doth by Himself He leaveth not for others to do. So seemeth our purgatory already past and done—not to come and remaining to be done. [See all N. S.'s discussions.]

P. 322. *Sir John Denby*, Gentleman. "The difference is ... Papists say that Christ is corporally, or in the forms of bread and wine. But the faithful say that Christ is not there—neither corporally nor spiritually, but in them that worthily eat and drink the bread and wine, &c. For figuratively He is in the bread and wine, and spiritually He is in them that worthily eat, &c.: but really carnally and corporally He is only in heaven, from whence He shall come, &c. Not that bread is the body or the wine the blood, but that in faith we do see the blessed body of our Saviour broken, &c., &c. Also in faith I hear Him call, 'Come unto Me, &c.' In faith I come unto Him and am refreshed, &c., do receive the fruit of the death of Christ, which fruit is our salvation. His body cannot be in more places than one. [Yet he says] so doth the inward man through faith eat the body of Christ. Even as that bread was divided so should His body and fruit of His passion be distributed unto as many as believed His words. And thus we there have Christ present. In the inward eye and sight of our faith we eat His body and drink His blood, *i.e.* we believe surely that His body was crucified for our sins and His blood shed for our salvation. [What confusion of ideas has reigned!]

P. 352. *Glover* to Mary his wife. "And because nothing displeaseth God so much as idololatry, *i.e.* false worshipping of God otherwise than God's word commandeth, look not back I say, nor turn your face to their idolatrous and blasphemous massing, manifestly against the word, practice and example of Christ; as it is most manifest to all that have any taste and true understanding of God's word that there remaineth nothing in the church of England at this present profitable or edifying, &c., all things being done in an unknown tongue contrary to the express commandment of the Holy Ghost. Christ's church heareth, teacheth, and is ruled by His words. [See Roger Ascham.]

P. 559. *From the primate's recantations under terror—from the fifth*. "As concerning the sacraments I believe and worship in the sacrament of the altar the very body and blood of Christ, being contained most truly under the forms of bread and wine; the bread through the mighty power of God being turned into the body of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and the wine into His blood.

P. 568. *Agnes Potton and Jane Trunchon*, burnt at Ipswich at same time. "Their opinion or persuasion was this—that in the sacrament was the memorial only of Christ's death and passion; for, said they, Jesus Christ is ascended up into heaven and is on the right hand of the Father according to the Scriptures, and not in the sacrament as He was born of the virgin Mary. For this they were burned.

P. 588. *Six at Colchester*. "To the seventh article Simon Joyne declared, &c. Moreover Christopher Lyster affirmed that in the said sacrament there is the substance of bread and wine, as well after the word of consecration as before, and that there is not in the same the very body and blood of Christ, really, substantially and truly, but only sacramentally and spiritually by faith in the faithful receivers, and that the mass is not propitiatory for the quick and the dead, &c. [See case of a blind boy, p. 589.] If the body of Christ were really and bodily in the sacrament, then whosoever received the sacrament received also the body. But the wicked receiving the sacrament receive not the body of Christ. Ergo, The body of Christ is not really in the sacrament. *Rev. Crashfield*. I believe that Christ's body was broken for me on the cross, and His blood shed for my redemption, whereof the bread and wine is a perpetual memory, the pledge of His mercy, the ring and seal of His promise, and a perpetual memory for the faithful unto the end of the world."

(VV.) BISHOP THOMAS MORTON OF DURHAM. B. 1564. D. 1659.

Born in the city of York. Fellow of St John's Cambridge, and Lecturer on Logic in the University. His preferments were Long Marston and Aylesford. He was Dean of Gloucester, Dean of Winchester, Prebendary of York and Bishop successively of Chester, Lichfield and Durham. He wrote several works full of earnestness and power; on Episcopacy, Popery, Church Ceremonies: but his chief work is that from which our quotations come. Perhaps one ought not to conceal that at the desire of King James I. he wrote the pernicious Book of Sports, which was burnt at last in London by the common hangman. No excuse can be alleged for a divine, who teaches men to secularize God's day of sacred rest. This movement of James I. hangs like a mill-stone on the reputation of that pedantic monarch, in whose favour otherwise little can be found. The Latin Letter of Dedication to the work on the Lord's supper by Bishop Morton

I have quoted in English. It may however be preferred to the book itself; as the latter is marked by a violence approaching very near to ranting against Popery, and therefore is very far from possessing what it is desired to make the characteristic mark of Protestantism. But the first extract alone may well bias the reader in favour of the letter dedicatory.

The entire title-page, omitting only the author's name, is printed as follows: "The institution of the sacrament of the blessed body and blood of Christ, by some called the Mass of Christ, eight books, discovering the superstitious sacrilegious and idolatrous abominations of the Roman Mass, together with the consequent obstinacies overtures of perjuries and the heresies discernible in the defenders thereof, much enlarged for corroboration of certain points throughout the whole, together with particular answers to such objections and cavils as have been hitherto made and raised by the adversarie against this work. Printed for Robert Melbourne. London, 1635."

*Ep. Dedic.* p. 1. "Christendom never possessed anything more sublime, nothing more holy and august than the sacrament of the eucharist, since by it we are in a certain way transformed into Christ Himself. To this institution I add in my book's frontispiece, by the determining of others, the additional name of The Mass. But some one perhaps wishes I had omitted this. Yet be of good courage whoever thou be, pious zealot and vehement hater of the popish mass. For the name *missa*, mass, carries its own omen with it, since it arose from *dismissing those that did not desire to partake of the eucharist*; for it plainly is fatal to the Roman mass, which allures and invites to it by all pandouring arts the mere spectators, as its lovers, as if nearly the whole of the religion of Christ consisted in that one theatric spectacle, and these (now judged fit to receive the eucharist) catholic antiquity commanded to depart, and heavily and bitterly visited those who stayed as shameless persons. I have chosen to make this prefatory observation, that I may not seem to stumble on the very threshold by that very word, the mass. [I fancy the bishop is right in the etymology of the word *missa*: but that the words *Ite, missa est communio*, were said when the communicants themselves were dismissed, and some add when the reserved communion was sent to some of the absent and in particular to the sick.]...Part I. That the ten rules of Christ are almost perpetually broken and violated, by the Trent-canon in the Roman mass, whether in greater shamelessness or impiety it is difficult to say. [These ten rules are the parts of the words of the institution—such

as 'Take ye,' broken by not receiving with their hands, and 'Drink ye,' by the denial of the cup to the lay-receiver.] For by blowing up these depravations they prefer to the universal customs the contrary use of a worse age *i.e.* that of the wiser modern Roman Church of the last 300 years, and call it retained so very long a time; then they prate that apostolic pretext and practice can be abrogated by the Pontiff of Rome; and moreover they put forth that, against Christ's example, holily and religiously observed through many ages backward by pontiffs themselves, the (modern) contrary custom is to be held for a law: yea further this also is little, since the Jesuit with mouth of blasphemy pronounces that though the command of Christ be plainly contrary, the pontiff can relax the Divine law itself. [It is plain that this great dignitary had full right to live in the half-castellan and half ecclesiastical edifice of his own glorious cathedral of Durham.]

Part II. The words, This is my body. "Its literal exposition being weakened and destroyed by the very contradictions of men on the Pontiff's side, other (points) concerning transubstantiation, concerning the corporal presence of Christ and its being united with the bodies of the communicants, concerning sacrifice properly so called, and finally concerning Divine adoration, all (these) portentous dogmas built on the literal interpretation must be weakened and fall with it.

P. 8. "We readily allow to Bellarmine, Alan, Maldonat and other asserters of the Roman mass, as is likely, their own acuteness of mind, their own exactness and perspicuity of judgment, and in fine an accurate knowledge of all things both in human and Divine learning; and yet not in such a way as to prevent our not finding in them truth in the charges they bring against our theologians—consistency in the defence of their own opinions—good faith and moderation in their continual cries, appeals and urgings of 'the Fathers,' 'the Fathers'." [I cannot but add that this bishop appears so skilfully to wield his controversial weapons, that as to mere truth, his hardest blows seem to be cautiously delivered; but yet it is war *à l'outrance*, to be followed by as severe reprisals as possible. It is controversy eminently against the chosen method of the present day: erring perhaps as much in defect of Christian love, as we are tempted to err in defect of outspoken fidelity.]

(WW.) JACOBUS ARMINIUS (properly James Harmensen or Hermann), PROFESSOR AT LEYDEN. B. 1560. D. 1609.

A native of Oudwater on the Yssel in South Holland, and a student at Marburg and Leyden, he finished his training under Beza at Geneva. But his first public lectures were delivered at Basle. He soon after drew down upon him the furious opposition of a leading professor at Leyden, Gomar, by putting forth ideas of a more moderate character than the Dutch Calvinists maintained regarding grace and predestination. His leading ideas were that a sufficiency of grace is provided, but that it is not in its nature irresistible. Gomar was not able to prevent his being made professor, which shews that Arminius had powerful supporters. But after his death his party, to which the good Barneveldt belonged, was annihilated in a political persecution. Arminius and his friends were called Remonstrants, which seems to indicate that they never really had the upper hand. Another name of them is Sublapsarians, from weakly deeming it easier to believe in the justice of the Divine decrees if they were not made till after the Fall: whereas the remedy against the suspicion of supporting fatalism seems rather to be found in a distinct acknowledgment of God's eternal foresight, and in a clear belief that His perfect foresight of the ever-growing issues of things ever accompanies, and we may almost say regulates, His distribution of favours and His determination of events both all along and in the end. But we have now to discern and estimate his teaching on the Lord's supper. A candid student will acknowledge a similar arbitrariness of assertion on this great subject of thought. I give one specimen to exhibit this: but it is on a point not of sufficient importance to insert both in the Latin original and in English. It is in the 60th Thesis, on sacraments as to their kind, *i.e.* generally [§ IV. p. 420]. "The signs are not of a natural kind (*naturalia*), so that they shew by their own nature the whole of that which they signify: but they depend on the will (of the Giver), *voluntaria*, and their meaning depends entirely on the will of the Instituter." This kind of overstatement breeds and almost necessitates endless controversy, making it (as some one has wittily said) not so much luminous as voluminous; but the worst thing is, that it furnishes precedents for similar inaccuracies on the opposite side, until the truth itself is lost in mist.



*Works.* Leyden. Thesis 62. *On Sacraments generally.*

"The sacraments of the New Testament differ not from those that were in use in the Old, because the former exhibit [Calvin's word] grace, but the latter signify or prefigure it.

Th. 64. *On the Lord's supper.* "Let us treat of the supper, which is the confirming [strengthening] sacrament... Its material is bread and wine, which are unchanged in essence, but remain what they were before, and are not as to place coupled [united] with Christ's body or blood, in such a way that His body is in or under or [is received] with the bread... The object is twofold: that our faith that the promise of grace which God has made and which has been confirmed by Christ's death and resurrection, and concerning the truth and certainty of our being grafted into Christ, may be more and more strengthened; the other object is (1) that the faithful may by the remembrance of Christ's death testify their own gratitude and obligation towards God; (2) that they may cherish charity among themselves; (3) that by this mark they may be distinguished from unbelievers.

Th. 65. *On the Papal mass.* "This kind of sacrifice is falsely assigned to the institution of the Lord's supper: for Christ did not institute a sacrifice, but a sacrament... It follows that it is unlawful to think that Christ can or ought to be offered by men, or by anyone else than Himself. For He is the alone victim and priest."

*Opera Theologica. Lugduni Batavorum, 1729. Thesis 62, De Sac.  
N. T. in genere.*

§ VII. Sacramenta N. T. a sacramentis in V. T. usurpatis non differunt quod illa gratiam exhibeant, ista vero significant vel præfigurent.

*Thesis 64. De cœnâ Domini.*

§ I. De confirmationis sacramento, cœnâ, agamus. § IV. Materia est panis et vinum, quæ secundum essentiam non mutantur, sed manent quod ante fuerunt, neque secundum locum corpori aut sanguini copulantur, ita ut corpus sit vel in vel sub vel cum pane... § VI. Finis est duplex; ut fides nostra erga promissionem gratiæ a Deo factam et Christi morte et resurrectione confirmatam, ac de nostræ in Christum insitionis veritate et certitudine magis magisque corroboretur: alter ut (1) fideles gratitudinem et obligationem suam erga Deum testentur mortis Christi recordatione, (2) ut charitatem inter se foveant, (3) ut hac notâ ab infidelibus secernantur.

*Thesis 65. De Missâ Papali.*

§ II....sacrificium falso cœnæ Dominicæ institutioni tribui: non enim instituit Christus sacrificium sed sacramentum... § IV. Accedit quod nefas sit existimare Christum offerri posse aut debere ab hominibus, aut ab ullo alio quam a Seipso. Ille enim solus est et Victima et Sacerdos...

(XX.) CORNELIUS À LAPIDE, PROFESSOR OF LOUVAIN AND ROME.  
B. 1566. D. 1637.

He particularly addressed himself to the task of interpreting St Paul's Epistles, and his commentary upon them is considered less rambling than what he has written on the other Scriptures. His aim he says in his dedication of the former work to the Archbishop of Malins is to give the most genuine and literal sense in a solid manner briefly, methodically, and clearly; and he adds that he takes from the Greek, Hebrew and Syriac texts "and from the fathers and doctors those things which prove or illustrate this genuine sense." Notwithstanding the faults charged upon the manner of his work, it is held to be a greater favourite than the more methodical commentaries of Maldonat on the four gospels and Estius on the epistles. Its abundant quotations from the fathers are one great source of its popularity. It usually extends to 10 or 11 volumes quarto or folio. His commentary on the Pentateuch is as much praised by some as that on St Paul's epistles. Possibly the stories and legends that his work contains have aided in no slight degree in making it popular. I have often thought that an edition of the Bible with bonâ-fide historical facts, and known events of common life and religious experience, ranged under the verse which each best illustrates, would be most interesting and most profitable. Everyone knows some incidents that would throw a flood of real light on particular Scriptures. Take Adam Clarke's story on David's being forbidden to build the temple because he had been a man of blood. But in fact those who believe that God's hand is at work in regulating every event in every man's life must needs acknowledge that a world of events, national, domestic and individual, have transpired, between which and God's word a real analogy is to be traced out, as between the physical and the moral worlds and God's actions in both. I have sometimes thought that a committee would do it best under the advice and influence of our cleverest and largest book publishers.

This Cornelius, whose discursive commentary has given the occasion of my casting these words on the waters, was originally named Van den Steen, and was a native of Bocholt near Liege. He became a Jesuit. The authority for the statements here made respecting him is said to be Richard Simon in his *Critical History of the Principal Commentaries*, &c.

1 Cor. xi. 24. "Christ arose while the sepulchre was shut, [Then comes the frequent mistaken assertion of those who forget that the angel had rolled away the stone] and He entered in to the disciples while the doors were shut. [But why is this assumed? For Christ may have opened them by His own power unseen: the Greek is 'the doors having been shut.'] *Therefore* at that time He was in the same place as the sepulchral stone and as the doors. Now I thus reason. If two whole bodies can be in the same place, *e.g.* Christ and the stone, then two parts also of the same body, *e.g.* the head and the feet of Christ, can be in the same place, that is in the same host. If two parts can be together then three also and four and five and as many as God shall choose to put in the same place. Christ teaches the same Matt. xix. 24. And God can bring a rich man to heaven, therefore a camel also through a needle's eye, therefore Christ's body also through a small 'host.' Now if two bodies can be in the same place, therefore by parity of reasoning the same body, that is Christ's, can be in divers places and 'hosts.' For both things are of like difficulty and like power and virtue ... God can expand an angel existing in a point ... so that he may locally occupy a whole sleeping-place; on the contrary He can contract him into a point ... God does the very same in bodies naturally, take the case of rarefaction and warming.

P. 305. "This is clear from the words about the cup. For if these words were the first to signify transubstantiation, it ought to be said, This, that is, wine is My blood, or the cup of My blood: *i.e.* it is turned into it, &c.

*Lugduni, 1864.*

1 Cor. xi. 24. Christus resurrexit clauso sepulchro, et ingressus est ad discipulos januis clausis. Ergo tum eodem loco fuit cum lapide sepulchrali et cum januis. Nunc sic argumentor, Si duo corpora tota possunt esse in eodem loco, *e.g.* Christus et lapis, ergo et duæ partes ejusdem corporis, *v.g.* caput et pedes Christi, possunt esse in eodem loco, in eadem videlicet hostiâ. Si duæ possunt esse simul ergo et tres et quatuor et quinque et quotquot Deus in eodem loco ponere volet. Idem docet Christus Matt. xix. 24. Atque Deus potest divitem ducere ad cælum ergo et camelum per foramen acûs ergo et corpus Christi per parvam hostiam. Jam si duo corpora possunt esse in eodem loco, ergo a pari idem corpus, scilicet Christi, potest esse in diversis locis et hostiis. Utrumque enim paris est difficultatis et paris potentiae et virtutis...Potest deus angelum in puncto existentem...dilatare...ut totum cubiculum occupet localiter: *e* contrario...contrahere in punctum... In corporibus naturaliter idipsum facit Deus, puta in rarefactione et calefactione.

P. 305.

Patet hoc ex verbis calicis. Si enim hæc primo significarent transubstantiationem, deberet dici "hoc" scilicet "vinum" est sanguis Meus vel est calix sanguinis Mei: id est convertitur, &c.

P. 304. "You will quote John vi., 'The Spirit is He Who quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing.' Therefore Christ's flesh is not present and is not eaten in the eucharist. I answer that that cannot be said, because in this sense it would be impious to say, that Christ's flesh that suffered and was crucified for us does not profit at all: and Christ most fully teaches and inculcates the contrary to this in all that chapter, that is, that He will Himself give His own flesh for the life and redemption of the world: therefore Christ's flesh profited and profits the world much. [The question is, Is Christ using the same terms, His flesh, *i.e.* giving His flesh, in different senses in the two parts of this chapter? the one giving His flesh on the cross, the other spiritual eating, and another the Jews' misunderstanding, the literal eating of His flesh.] The sense therefore is, as Cyril rightly says, First the virtue of life-giving which Christ's flesh in the eucharist has, it has not of itself, but of the Spirit, *i.e.* the Divinity of the Word, to which the flesh is hypostatically conjoined. Secondly, as Chrysostom says, this eating does not take place in a carnal way, by tearing it with the teeth, like beef, but in a way that is spiritual and fit for the spirit of man, *i.e.* secretly, sacramentally, invisibly. For thou dost equally eat Christ here, as if thou shouldst eat and swallow an angel hidden [in the elements].

Matt. xxvi. 28. "This was the effect of the eucharist. For this (eucharist) supplied to the disciples themselves strength and joy in all trials and punishments. Wherefore formerly in the time of the persecutions all the Christians used to communicate daily, that they might thus be strong to endure martyrdom; yea they

P. 304.

Dices Joann. vi. "Spiritus est qui vivificat; caro non prodest quicquam." Ergo caro Christi non est præsens nec comeditur in eucharistiâ. Respondeo id non posse dici, quia hoc sensu impium esset dicere, quod caro Christi pro nobis passa et crucifixa non prodest quidquam: cujus contrariam toto illo capite disertissime docet et inculcat Christus, scilicet se carnem Suam daturum pro mundi vitâ et redemptione: ergo multum mundo profuit et prodest caro Christi. Sensus itaque est, ut recte Cyrillus, Primo virtutem vivificandi, quam habet caro Christi in eucharistiâ, non a se habere, sed a Spiritu, *i.e.* Divinitate Verbi, cui hypostaticè conjungitur. Secundo ut Chrysost. hanc manducationem non fieri modo carnali, eam laniando dentibus, instar carnis bubulæ, sed modo spirituali et spiritui accommodato, *i.e.* occulte, sacramentaliter, invisibiliter. Perinde enim hic carnem Christi comedis ac si latentem angelum comederes et transglutires.

Matt. xxvi. 28. Hic fuit effectus eucharistiæ. Hæc enim ipsi robur et gaudium suggerebat in omnibus tentationibus et suppliciis. Quocirca olim tempore persecutionum Christiani omnes quotidie communicabant, ut sic roborarent ad martyrium, imo eucharistiam domum

used to carry the eucharist home and used to take it early in the morning with their own hands, as Mary Stuart, queen of the Scots lately did, while she was detained captive in England and could not have a priest with her. Further Chrysostom, Homily 36 on 1 Cor. says, 'Where Christ in the eucharist is, there also is not 'lacking a crowd of angels; but where such a king and such a 'chief is, there is a Celestial palace, yea Heaven itself.' Wherefore we read in the lives of the fathers from St Ammon, that, while he was celebrating (the eucharist), an angel was seen by him to stand by the altar and to mark the communicants (with the sign) and to write down their names in a book. But S. Chrysostom, in books III. and VI. on the priesthood, relates that bands of angels were seen around the altar, who with bent head did reverence to Christ, and uttered dreadful noises ... When therefore we communicate or celebrate or hear the mass, let us think that we are sitting by Christ in the last supper and supping with Him. Yea let us think that Christ is speaking by the priest's mouth, is celebrating, is transubstantiating the bread and wine into His own body and blood, and with that [His body] is feeding us and making us fat. For Christ is here the principal agent and wonder-worker, as the Council of Trent teaches, Session XII. Whence S. Ambrose in his eighth book on Luke says, 'There is a body of which it is said, My 'flesh is truly food. Around this body are true eagles, that fly 'around with spiritual wings.' And book 4 on the sacrament, c. 2, '(It is) well (said), Eagles are round the altar, where the 'body is.'

---

deferebant, illamque mane suis manibus sumebant (uti fecit nuper Maria Stuarta Scotiæ regina dum in Angliâ captiva detineretur nec sacerdotem secum habere posset)....(5) Porro Chrysost. Hom. 36 in 1 Cor. "Ubi," ait, "est Christus in eucharistiâ, ibi etiam non deest angelorum frequentia; ubi autem est talis rex et talis princeps, ibi est cœleste "palatium, imo ipsum cœlum." Quocirca in vitis patrum legimus de S. Ammon. quod, eo celebrante, angelus visus sit astare altari, et communicantes signare, eorumque nomina in libro describere. S. Chrysost. vero, lib. 3 et 6, de sacerdotio, narrat angelorum choros circa altare visos, qui inclinato capite suo Christo exhiberent reverentiam, ac horrendos ederent clamores...(6) Cum ergo communicamus aut missam celebramus vel audimus, cogitemus nos Christo in ultimâ cenâ assidere, cum Eoque cœnare. Imo cogitemus Christum per os sacerdotis loqui, celebrare, transubstantiare panem et vinum in corpus Suum et sanguinem, illoque nos pascere et saginare. Christus enim hic est principalis agens et thaumaturgus, uti docet Concilium Tridentinum, Sess. 12. Unde S. Ambrosius, lib. 8 in Lucam, "Est corpus," ait, "de quo dictum "est, Caro Mea vere est cibus. Circa hoc corpus sunt veræ aquilæ, "quæ alis circumvolant spiritualibus." Et lib. 4, de Sacram., c. 2, "Bene aquilæ sunt circa altare ubi corpus est."

P. 484. "Luke freely has it, 'This cup is my blood, &c.' The cup of blood is shed in the eucharist not on the cross (for there was no cup there). [But Cornelius à Lapide forgets to remark that Christ's blood was 'poured out' on the cross: but in the Lord's supper it is not poured out but drunk; therefore though St Luke's words are that the cup was poured out for the remission of sins, we argue that the meaning must be, My blood (represented by the wine and the cup), which is in process of being shed for the forgiveness of sins] ... Hence it is plain that these things more properly look to the eucharistic sacrifice than [to the sacrifice] of the cross."

P. 484.

Lucas disertè habet τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον, κ.τ.λ....calix sanguinis effusus est in eucharistia non in cruce (ibi enim nullus fuit calix)...Hinc liquet hæc magis proprie spectare ad sacrificium eucharisticum quam crucis.

(YY.) S. FRANÇOIS DE SALES. A PUPIL OF MALDONAT AT  
PARIS. B. 1567. D. 1622.

The life of this eminent opponent of the Reformation in Switzerland leaves you with a strong inclination towards believing that sometimes the same soul appears a second time in the world. Mutatis mutandis he is Francis of Assisi over again. We have to make certain allowances for differences arising from the former being a clothier's son and the latter of a noble family: also for the first living three centuries before the general Reformation, and the second being in the generation next after it; but the likeness is marvellous. Perhaps if we knew more about his mother's mental history, we might know that the first St Francis was her ideal all along, and that she in no small degree prayed, and trained her own son into what he became. The great advantage of this St Francis was that Scripture light was more common, and he had a richer acquaintance with it. As to foundations, there was no room for establishing a new male order; but tender and impulsive woman is always ready. So Madame de Chantal became his sister Clare: and in all that he did, his leading characteristic was identical with that of his great predecessor, to overcome sinners and sin by loving-kindness and forgiveness. Entire self-surrender, so that he did not breathe out of his work, was common to both. In both there was as little of acidity as was compatible with celibate asceticism. Both were in the world at times but

never of it: and as to any difference in the holding of the whole compass of Roman Catholic doctrine there was almost none. The Reformation had produced less effect on the mind of the latter than we should have thought possible. Calvin was to him simply a heretic. And most particularly both the Francises held fast to what may be termed the great triple priestly chain, confession, absolution and the giving of an entire Christ in the Lord's supper. It is curious that in some modern histories or biographies it is all confessing and receiving the holy sacrifice, absolution being kept out of sight as much as possible. But it was never in fact omitted. It is an essential part of the chain by which the priesthood held the people fast bound. And in this day, when no stone is left unturned to rebuild the practice of confession, and to restore belief in the actual gift of Christ's body to communicants of the second sacrament, we may be quite sure that so comforting a practice as priestly absolution is very seldom if ever omitted. Confession, absolution and the bodily presence are the three feet of the priestly throne, the three pillars of the Roman tabernacle. (But in a book that I have been reading, the practice of confession is exhibited only as a kind of helpful means for attaining a higher life.) St François de Sales preaches, and confession is affectionately and not in vain urged upon his hearers. It is in fact his "after meeting." Revivalists and Missionists have need to beware, for it is impossible not to see that Popery and Revivals and Special Missions come very near to each other here, that is to say, so long as men as good as the two Francises are the confessors—men who shrink from the base and debasing turpitude under which the confessional can fall, although from such vileness it was ever by them apparently kept free. It is true that confessionalism stands ever on a steep descent, and has a strong natural inclination to go downwards: but this may in certain cases be wholly escaped. In fact to see this devout minister of the Roman church practising confession, his father and his mother travelling over to him, thus to put themselves under his spiritual direction before coming to the sacrament, makes us enquire whether no other kind of evil attached itself to this practice: and it is impossible not to observe in both the Francises, how full was the belief in the power of confession followed by absolution. They both take it for granted that the sinner has at one stroke become a saint, that it is im-

possible that the process can have failed: and sometimes the very tenderness of their love and confidence does seem to have been used of God to promote so great a change. But suddenly to assume that it was of necessity always so, and for the officiating Francis to change seats with a criminal that has confessed and been absolved, and to confess to him, seems like a parody and a travesty of the words "Confess your faults one to another, and "pray one for another, that ye may be healed." In a word may we not say that confessing faults to a minister is so inextricably connected with asking spiritual advice from him, and that such advice is necessarily in so great a degree confidential and private, that it must ever lie open to abuse by bad ministers or by those that have unscriptural ideas of the proper extent of priestly power: and that the chief thing for a church to do, besides putting forth such cautions as our Prayer-book contains, is to disallow personal absolutions by ministers, on the ground that it is, to say the least, to be much doubted whether any passage of the New Testament gives any such power, and for every church of a Protestant order to deny throughout its formularies any bodily presence of Christ in the sacrament. Without the other two links confession alone will be but little adopted: but if the minister is allowed to follow the receiving of confessions by granting personal absolution, and by teaching that then he gives the very body and blood of Christ in the second sacrament, not in any metaphorical and spiritual, but in a true, real and natural manner, thousands and tens of thousands of half-instructed souls will grasp the offered salvation according to what we cannot but call antichrist's gospel for the remission of sins. Bishops can but occasionally detect and visit such practices.

I. p. 310. "*The spirit of S. Francis of Sales, by the Bishop of Belley.* They had observed that I was a very long time in preparing before the holy mass, &c. He wished to correct me in this [from this]. He came to see me at Belley, according to the custom of our mutual annual visits. It happened during the time of his

---

Paris, 1850. Vol. I. p. 310, Pt. I. c. 17.

*Esprit de S. Francois de Sales par l'Eveque M. de Belley.* On l'avoit averti que j'étois extremement long a me preparer avant la sainte messe, &c. Il voulut me corriger de cela. Il m'étoit venu voir a Belley, selon la coutume de nos visites annuelles reciproques. Il arriva que,



staying at my house, that he had one morning a quantity of despatches to make that detained him very late in his room. Eleven o'clock approached and he had not yet said the mass, which he never on any day omitted ; if he were not ill or very much put out of his way. He came then to the chapel robed in his rochet and humeral, and after having saluted those who were there, he made a rather short prayer at the foot of the altar, robed himself and said the mass. Having completed it he fell on his knees again and after a rather short prayer he came to find us with so serene a face that he appeared to me like an angel, until they called us to the repast, which was soon after. ... Is it not a fine thing to see the Bishop of Belley taking to task the Bishop of Geneva for going too fast, and him of Geneva taking to task him of Belley for going too slowly ? Is not the world turned upside down ?

I. p. 529. "Introduction to a life of devotion. Preface. I try by some remonstrances and exercises to turn Philothea's simple desire into an entire resolve, which she at last makes after her general confession by a fixed protestation followed by the holy communion, in which, as she gave herself to her Saviour and *received Him*, she enters happily into His holy love. When that was done, to conduct her to a more advanced stage, I shewed her two great means of uniting herself more and more to the Divine majesty ; the use of the sacraments, by which our good God comes to us ; and holy prayer, by which He draws us to Himself ...

durant le temps de son séjour en notre maison, il eut un matin quantité de depeches à faire qui l'arrêtèrent fort tard dans la chambre. Onze heures approchoient, et il n'avoit encore point dit la messe, ce qu'il n'omettoit aucun jour, s'il n'étoit malade, ou fort incommodé. Il vient donc à la chapelle, revêtu de son rochet et carmail, et apres avoir salué ceux qui étoient là, il fit une assez courte priere au pied de l'autel, s'habille et dit la messe. L'ayant achevée il se remit aux genoux ; et apres une priere assez courte, il nous vint trouver avec un visage si serein, qu'il me paroissoit comme un ange, jusqu'à ce qu'on nous appellât pour la table, qui fut peu apres... N'est ce pas une belle chose que l'évêque de Belley reprenne celui de Geneve d'aller trop vite ? et celui de Geneve celui de Belley d'aller trop lentement ? n'est pas le monde renversé ?

*Preface à l'Introduction à la vie devote, I. p. 529.*

Je m'essaye par quelques remonstrances et exercices de convertir le simple desir de Philotée en une entiere resolution, qu'elle faict à la parfin, apres sa confession generale par une solide protestation, suivie de la sainte communion, en laquelle se donnant à son Sauveur, et le recevant, elle entre heureusement en Son saint amour. Cela faict, pour la conduire plus avant, je lui monstre deux grands moyens de s'unir de plus en plus à Sa divine Majesté ; l'usage des sacrements, *par lesquels ce bon Dieu vient à nous*, et la sainte oraison, par laquelle Il nous tire à Soi.

III. 243—352. "Three sermons to shew *the truth* of the holy sacrament of the altar. My flesh is truly food, John vi.

P. 244. "I find that speaking generally a body cannot be present, nor be applied and joined to another, nor consequently be eaten, except in three ways; really and not spiritually; spiritually and not really; really and spiritually both together. The first way is real but unrefined, according to nature, and loaded. The second is spiritual, metaphorical, and with little of truth in it. The third is as much real as the first, as much spiritual as the second: it is more admirable than the first and the second. Let us consider this more particularly and see which of the three forms is the more suitable to the presence and eating of the body of our Lord at the very holy sacrament... [P. 247.] I began to shew that the form in which our Lord was in this sacrament was not anything harsh or horrible, but very sweet and gracious. Now... I will shew that there is no impossibility in this holy sacrament that a body should be in a spot without occupying room, and keeping this outward extension which we see naturally in other bodies. [The Roman mode of presence, neither perceptible nor material, and yet having *some* of the usual attributes of matter still.] (2) That transubstantiation is in no way impossible but also very true in this sacrament. (3) I should draw from all that I have said the adoration of this holy sacrament. O Lord, I will praise Thy almighty power with all my heart, if only Thou openest my lips to

*Vol. III. 243—352.*

Trois sermons pour la vérité du saint sacrement de l'autel. Caro Mea vere est cibus, John vi.

P. 244. Je trouve que parlant généralement un corps ne peut estre present, n'y estre appliqué au conjoint d'un autre, ni par consequent estre mangé, qu'en trois sortes: reellement et non spirituellement; spirituellement et non reellement: reellement et spirituellement tout ensemble. La premiere sorte est réelle, mais grossiere naturelle et chargée. La seconde est spirituelle metaphorique et peu véritable. La troisieme est autant réelle que la premiere, autant spirituelle que la seconde; elle est plus admirable que la premiere et la seconde. Considerons ceci plus particulierement, et voyons quelle des trois façons est plus convenable à la presence et manducation du corps de nostre Seigneur au très saint sacrement. P. 247. Je commençai a monstrier que la façon en laquelle nostre Seigneur estoit en ce sacrement n'estoit aucunement dure ni horrible, mais très suave et gracieuse. Maintenant... je monstrierai qu'il n'y a nulle impossibilité en ce saint sacrement qu'un corps soit en un lieu sans y occuper place et garder cette extension extérieure que nous voyons estre naturellement aux autres corps. 2. Que la transubstantiation n'est aucunement impossible, ains très véritable en ce sacrement. 3. Je deduirai de tout ce que j'ai dit l'adoration de ce saint sacrement. O Seigneur, je louerai de tout mon cœur vostre toute-puissance, pourvue

speak thy praises ; I will adore Thy majesty in the holy sacrament ;  
 if thou only holdest Thy words in my heart : for Thy words will  
 instruct me that Thou art there really and truly man of God ; and  
 that Thy presence is not more impossible to Thy will, though it be  
 incomprehensible by our weak understandings, than the rest of  
 Thy admirable works. That this prayer may be received of His  
 Divine goodness let us join to it the intercession of our lady.  
 Ave, Mary... [P. 251.] Let us conclude then that after the  
 consecration the true body of our Lord is there and that there is  
 not any other substance there whatever. It is there, I say, really  
 and very truly.

P. 250. "We must not say that His body is there and the  
 bread too : for if any one should sell a sack with half corn and  
 half oats, and should say, 'Buy this, for it is corn,' he would with-  
 out doubt be deceiving the world, and would be deemed to have  
 told a lie... When then Jesus says, This is My body, He shews  
 clearly that the bread is changed. [P. 254.] Seven reasons why  
 the literal meaning must be adopted.

---

que vous ouvriez mes levres à vos louanges ; j'adorerai vostre Majesté  
 au saint sacrement ; pourvue que vous teniez tousjours vos parolles  
 en mon cœur, car vos parolles m'instruiraient que *vous y estes* homme de  
 Dieu *reellement et veritablement*, et que cette vostre presence n'est non  
 plus impossible a vostre volonte, quoi qu'incomprehensible a nos foibles  
 entendemens, que le reste de vos œuvres admirables. Afin que cette  
 priere soit receue de Sa divine bonté joignons y l'intercession de nostre  
 dame. Ave Maria... P. 251. Concluons donc qu'après la consecration  
 le vrai corps de nostre Seigneur y est, et n'y a point d'autre substance  
 quelle quelle soit. Il y est dis-je reellement et tres veritablement.

P. 250.

Il ne faut pas dire que Son corps y soit, et le pain aussi : car qui  
 vendroit un sac, moitié froment et moitié avoine, et diroit, Achetez  
 cecy, car est froment : sans doute qu'il tromperoit le monde, et seroit  
 réputé pour avoir dit un mensonge... Quand donc Il dit Hoc est corpus  
 Meum, Il monstre clairement que le pain est changé. P. 254, Seven  
 reasons for the literal sense.

(ZZ.) DOCTOR ANDREW WILLET. B. 1562. D. 1621.

The laborious and keen-sighted author of the Synopsis Papismi  
 cannot be ignored here, though his argumentation is too minutely  
 developed to allow of being adequately quoted. In his descrip-  
 tions of Popish doctrine on the Lord's supper he chiefly draws from  
 three sources, (1) The Rhemish commentators, as reprinted at full

and replied to by Dr Fulke; (2) Bellarmine's one great work, Concerning Controversies, in its three folios, and (3) The Decrees and Canons of the Council of Trent; but other authorities are cited when requisite. He reasons with the utmost calmness, like a man who felt that the setting forth of the simple truth was his mission. He was born in Ely, and went to its grammar school, and thence to Peterhouse, till a fellowship at Christ's was given to him. His mind came very early to maturity. Though he preached at court as chaplain to the King, his public teaching seems to have been of a plain clear and simple style, but cheerful as well as grave. He was a good pattern of a Christian. His blameless life corresponded with his love of truth in study. The last thing he did, as he was near to dying, was to hear and comment on the 146th Psalm. He had been busily engaged in elucidating the Old Testament. The Synopsis, though his largest work, is but the first among many; for he was a very fruitful father of books, as well as of children. He had fourteen of the latter. His father was Rector of Barley in Hertfordshire, and his son succeeded him there. But his father had been a Prebendary of Ely by the appointment of Bishop Cox in Queen Elizabeth's reign.

*Synopsis Papismi.* Reformation Soc.'s Edition, London, 1852.

Vol. v. p. 17. "Bellarmine chargeth us with three great untruths: first that we hold that the words of institution are not necessary in every sacrament, but in Baptism only. Secondly, that we say a sermon is of the essence of the sacrament. Thirdly, that the words of institution do not serve at all towards consecration or benediction of the elements. But our opinion is this. We do not hold that it is an essential part of a sacrament, always to have a sermon before it, as they understand a sermon: which notwithstanding were most convenient, and *always to be wished*: but this we affirm that a sacrament cannot be rightly ministered unless there be a declaration and shewing forth of the Lord's death, not only in the visible action of breaking and distributing the elements, but also in setting forth the end of the Lord's death out of the word of God with an exhortation to thankfulness; which is always observed amongst us in the daily celebration and receiving of the sacrament. [I presume he means in the service of the national Church of England: but he may mean with all orthodox Protestants.] Concerning the words of the institution we also grant that they are necessarily to be used in the celebration of the sacrament; but not as the Papists use them. For first they make them not all of one value, but out of the whole institu-

tion pick out certain consecratory words, as they call them, as, This is My body, This is the cup: whereas the other words, Take ye, Eat ye, Drink ye, Do this in remembrance, do as well belong to the consecration as any other. Secondly, they say, that the words of institution do not serve anything at all for the instruction of the people to shew them the right use of the sacrament, but only for benediction and consecration of the elements. Bellarm. tom. 3, c. 19, p. 71, &c. Ingolstadt, 1601. Thirdly, they do hold that only by the pronouncing of those words the elements are consecrated; whereas by the whole action and celebration of the sacrament, the giving, receiving, invocation, thanksgiving according to Christ's institution, the consecration is performed upon the elements. Fulke, 1 Corinthians x. § 4, p. 510, London, 1633. [Then follow two pages of argumentation.]

P. 36. "Ninety-ninth error. The first part. Whether sacraments of themselves do give or confer grace. The Papists [say], The sacraments give grace 'ex opere operato'—by the work wrought—*i.e.* by force and virtue of the work and word done and said in the sacrament. Rhemist. Act. 22. § 1. Fulke, London, 1633. So that not only faith justifieth but the sacraments also and other works of religion. The sacraments then are [in the view of Papists] immediate instruments and efficient causes of our justification: not mediately, as they nourish and increase our faith, but properly and in themselves. [This is explained in several parts of these volumes by an inherent virtue resident in, and going out of the sacraments themselves, God having willed that they should have this power lodged in them, so that the mere act of the minister in ministration is sufficient to call it forth, and does so cause it to go forth.] Faith in the receiver gives no efficiency to the sacrament, but only taketh away the lets and hindrances which might hinder the efficacy of the sacrament, &c., &c. Bell. lib. 2, de Sac. cap. 1." [I must not cite more; but as the proverb is, Ex ungue leonem. This shews what Willet is.]

The last scene of his life is so sweet, as given in Abel Redivivus, that I append it almost entire.

"Upon the tenth day after his hurt [by a fall in riding] he reposed himself to rest. Early in the morning, upon occasion of the tolling of the bell for one then at the point of death, he suddenly awoke ... He then took occasion to discourse with her [his wife] touching the joys of Heaven and the saints' mutual acknowledgment of one another in that blessed estate; which discourse ended, he with his wife sang a hymn, composed by himself, wherewith they usually every morning praised God for their rest the night past and prayed His blessing for the day succeeding. Their spirits being thus raised, they continued their melody and

sang the 146th Psalm. He sometime stopped a little, and glossing upon the words applied divers things therein unto himself and to his present condition. And on the sudden his hour being now come [Gennadius concio de morte] fetching a deep sigh or groan, he sank down in his bed. But help coming in, upon means used he seemed to raise up himself a little, and then said 'Let me 'alone, I shall do well, Lord Jesus.' And with that word he gave up the ghost. His body was carried ... to his town of Barley and was in his chancel solemnly interred ... with many tears. And there lieth, covered with a fair graven stone of marble. In the lines that follow are these two,

'Whose lamp was ever shining, never hid,  
'And when his tongue preached not his actions did."

Such a man is a pattern to those that have to write controversy.

(AAA.) BROTHER PETER CAPRERA.

P. 46. "The sacraments of the new law signify that grace is to be conferred by the sacraments themselves, as by instruments of Christ's passion. One of the chief benefits is that grace will be conferred on us by the sacraments, as from the work done.

P. 959. "Not all sacraments are equal and like, which indeed, against the heretics of the present time...who deny that the Lord is *really* in the sacrament of the eucharist especially above all other...And first because the sacrament of the eucharist substantially contains Christ: but the rest contain some virtue from their institution communicated to us from Christ...All others are ordained with reference to the eucharist as to their end [completion, τέλος], all are consummated in the eucharist."

*Caprera Frati Petri. Madrid, 1611, P. 46.*

Sacramenta legis novæ significant gratiam conferendam per ipsamet sacramenta, *tantum per instrumenta passionis Christi*. Unum ex præcipuis beneficiis est, ut nobis gratia per sacramenta ex opere operato conferetur.

P. 959.

Non omnia sacramenta esse æqualia et paria, quod quidem contra hæreticos hujus temporis, præsertim sacramentarios, negantes Christum esse *realiter* in eucharistiæ sacramento potissimum omnium aliorum... Tum primo quia sacramentum eucharistiæ continet substantialiter Christum; reliqua vero continent quandam virtutem institutionalem participatam a Christo.. Omnia alia ordinantur ad eucharistiam sicut finem. Omnia in eucharistiâ consummantur.

This Spanish divine is valuable as giving to us the essence of Roman sacramental doctrine. His saying, that the sacraments are in direct and almost organic connexion with the cross, for that they are its instruments by which it acts upon us, is bold, for forgiveness of sins by sacraments follows from this assertion as a matter in due course: and no wonder he adds *ex operato*. In this system the sacrament, of itself, independent of the faith of the recipient, saves. This receptionism without faith is the modern prevalent belief of an increasing number. Then he uses the Latin word *realiter* of the *res ipsa*, the body of Christ itself: which also many mean by the term the *res sacramenti*. And lastly, the making the Lord's supper the centre and queen, the end and perfection, the finis of all other ordinances (had he quoted Greek, he would have said the τέλος of them all), is the view that crowns the whole. The counter-doctrine is that all sacraments minister to the implanting and cherishing of faith in the soul, and perhaps none are quite like the Lord's supper, but that without living faith it and all sacraments and means are nothing but signs without life, channels without living water.

(BBB.) RICHARD CRAKANTHORP, D.D. B. 1567. D. 1624.

This remarkable divine was a native of Westmorland. He was born at a village near Penrith, named Strickland. He went to Oxford, to Queen's College, and was elected fellow at twenty-two. He became Rector of Black Nobley, a village in Essex, and combined a reputation for wide doctrinal and canonical knowledge with considerable power as a preacher, so that he held the office of a preacher before James I. in the Royal Chapel. His great work has been reprinted in the Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. It is entitled in my edition of 1625, A Defence of the English Church against the injurious statements (injuries) of Mark Antony de Dominis Lord Archbishop of Spalatro (in Dalmatia). The editor of it speaks of Crakanthorp as omni virtute doctrinâque spectatissimi. The Archbishop of Spalatro had retired to England wearied with his own doubts respecting Roman doctrines, and having received much public notice actually went so far as to publish a book against them: but pressed with entreaties to return to the Roman communion he fell under

suspicion at the English court and received orders to quit this country. It was in reply to what he afterwards published on the state of religion in England that Crakanthorp published his Defence, from which our extracts are taken. He wrote two other works. One is against Baronius, entitled, *Rome's Seer Overseen*; a treatise on the fifth General Council, held at Constantinople A.D. 533: and the other is entitled, *A Defence of Constantine*, with a treatise on the Pope's temporal monarchy. The editor of the Defence, Dr John Barkham, since it was what is called a posthumous publication, inscribes for its motto Rev. xiv. 13, but he changes the verb into a future tense making it "opera eorum sequentur eos;" "Their works shall follow them." In his prefatory letter addressed to King James, after no little amount of adulation to the reigning monarch, it does not much surprise to find the strongest words given in the Holy Scripture to Judas applied without hesitation to the recreant archbishop. In fact he calls him by the traitor's own name, "Quid aliud isti quam Judæ, qui...abiit ad locum suum." More follows, but how could he surpass this?

P. 506. "Of the service of eucharist—in which the weakness of the Archbishop of Spalatro is proved in his saying, 'that there is not even a suspicion of idolatry in the service, which their eucharists exhibit.' You say 'they object against us that there is the most open idolatry in our adoring the holy eucharist—that is to say 'our adoring the bread.' We do object and deservedly. What have you to set against our objection? You say, 'Our adversaries cannot even suspect that we in this adoration of the eucharist are chargeable with the error of idolatry.' What say you? They can't even suspect you of it? To what purpose then are there so many and great volumes written by those of your side to clear you of this charge of idolatry, since there is not indeed, nor can

---

*Defensio ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, &c. London, 1625, c. 71, P. 506.*

De cultu eucharistiæ, ubi vanitas Arch. Spalat. demonstratur, cum dicat, "in cultu, quem eucharistiæ exhibent, ne suspicionem quidem esse idolatriæ."... "Objiciunt," inquis, "nobis apertissimam in sanctâ eucharistiâ adorandâ idolatriam—panis videlicet adorationem." Objicimus quidem, et merito. Quid tu habes quod opponas? "Ne suspicari quidem," inquis, "possunt adversarii, nos in hac eucharistiæ adoratione idolatriæ errori esse obnoxios." Quid ais? ne suspicari quidem possunt. Quorsum igitur tot tamque grandia volumina a vestris scripta, ut crimen hæc idolatriæ eluatis, cujus ne suspicio quidem ullâ



be even a suspicion of it? Do you know at all the Archbishop of Spalatro? See whether he would not teach you that there is some suspicion [of this fault] lying here underneath. The following, as you know, are his words (Scopus I.) 'Alas! to this bread are prayers poured forth, and adoration is rendered as to the only true God, and this is idolatry of the lowest kind real and formal.' Is this then clearly enough said? But hear him also again. 'From this great error of an impossible and incomprehensible transubstantiation, by which they determine that bread is truly and really transmuted into the true and entire body of Christ, a true and real idolatry arises in the mass, in which the host is lifted up so that it is adored for the true God, and yet really and truly is true and real bread.' (2) But let us see how beautifully you prove that in this you are not idolaters. 'The real and corporal presence of the Lord's body and blood in the very sacred mysteries of the eucharist is to us most certain'... There is to you no certainty at all, either that he that consecrates is a priest, or even a baptized man: or that he intends to do what the church does; or that bread has ever been transubstantiated into Christ's body; or that transubstantiation can be effected in that way... Ye neither know any of these things certainly and infallibly nor can ye know without special revelation...(3) But by what method do you here excuse yourselves from idolatry? 'We adore Christ's body itself lying hid under the species (appearances, properties or qualities) of itself with the true latria (higher worship) on account of the hypostatic (personal) union.' You have well and

---

est, imo, nec esse potest? Nostin' Dominum Archiepiscopum Spalatensem? Vide annon te ille doceat suspicionem aliquam hic subesse, aut subesse posse. Hæc, ut scis, illius verba sunt (Spalat. Scop. I.) "Heu! pani huic preces funduntur, et adoratio quasi unico et vero Deo præstatur, quæ est maxime oppressa propria et formalis idololatria." Satin' hoc clare? Sed et iterum audi. "Ab hoc grandi impossibilis et incomprehensibilis transubstantiationis errore, per quem panem volunt vere et realiter in verum (omit vinum) et integrum Christi corpus transmutari, oritur vera et realis idololatria in missâ, in quâ elevatur hostia, ut pro vero Deo adoretur, et tamen vere ac realiter verus est ac realis panis." [Such had been the Archbishop's painting of Popery when in England.] (2) Sed videamus quam belle vos idololatrias in hoc non esse probas. (Cons. red. p. 47, i.e. after his return to the continent.) "Nobis præsentia realis ac corporalis corporis et sanguinis Domini in eucharistiæ sacrosanctis mysteriis est certissima"... Certitudo vobis nulla neque quod is qui consecrat sacerdos sit, aut vel baptizatus: neque quod intendit facere quod facit ecclesia; neque panem unquam transubstantiatum esse in Christi corpus; neque quod possibile sit ita transubstantiatio... Nihil horum certo et infallibiliter vel scitis, vel sine speciali revelatione scire potestis...(3) Quomodo vero vos ab idololatriâ tu hic excusas? [Cons. red. p. 47.] "Nos ipsum corpus Christi de se ob unionem hypostaticam adorabile, verâ latriâ

significantly used the word 'lying hid.' For certainly it lies hid from bodily eyes, from the eyes of reason, from the eyes of men, from the eyes of angels, from the eyes of the glorified, from the eyes of others, from the eyes of Christ Himself....(4) But tell me seriously. Do ye adore that hidden body of Christ of itself? Is it of itself to be adored with the higher worship? Beware lest ye be worshippers of men, and fall under that anathema of the council of Ephesus (as quoted).

P. 510, c. 72. "Transubstantiation is not proved either out of St John's ch. vi., or out of Christ's words, Matt. xxvi. (2) You say, 'Christ promised that He would give His own flesh. Joh. vi. '51, The bread which I will give is My flesh.' But He did not say, The bread which I will give to be eaten by your teeth in the eucharist, that bread is My flesh. He said, 'The bread which I will give, I will give, namely, to be sacrificed on the cross, I will give to be eaten by the hearts of all the faithful by faith. That bread is truly My flesh. Christ Himself shews that He is not speaking of sacramental, but of spiritual eating, when he says vv. 35, 40. And in v. 35, what is to come to Christ but to believe in Christ? The body of Christ is eaten by faith. By faith His blood is drunk...See Augustine. [And so on through 35 more paragraphs. C. 73, of 60 paragraphs, is a catena of patristic passages on his side.]

P. 574. "From what has been said about transubstantiation it

"sub speciebus latens, adoramus." Bene dixisti et signanter "latens." Certe enim latet oculos corporia, oculos rationis, oculos hominum, oculos angelorum; oculos glorificatorum, oculos aliorum, oculos ipsius Christi. [He then quotes Durandus, Arch. S. and Thomas Aquinas.] (4) Verum dic serio. An latens illud corpus Christi de se adoratis? An de se adorabile est patriâ? Cave ne anthropolatræ sitis, et in illud anathema sancti Ephesini concilii incidatis [Anath. VIII. C. E.].

C. 72, p. 510.

Transubstantiatio non probatur vel ex cap. 6 Johannis vel ex verbis Christi Matt. 26, &c. (2) "Promisit," inquis, "Christus Joh. vi. 51 Se daturum carnem Suam. Panis quem Ego dabo, caro Mea est." Sed non dixit, Panis, quem Ego dabo, in eucharistiâ dentibus comedendum, panis ille est caro Mea. Dixit panis quem dabo—dabo nempe in cruce immolandum, dabo fidelium omnium cordibus fide comedendum. Panis est vero ille caro Mea. Christus Ipse non de sacramentali, sed spirituali esu loqui demonstrat, cum ait v. 35 et v. 40. Et v. 35, Quid est venire in Christum nisi credere in Christum? [Aug. Tract. 26 in Joh.] Fide editur Christi corpus; fide sanguis Ejus bibitur.

C. 74, p. 574.

Ex iis quæ de transubstantiatione dicta sunt, duo consequi decla-

is declared that two things follow : (1) that there is not in the mass a true and proper sacrifice : (2) that the eucharist is not to be adored, and that the party of the pope, which adores it, are idolaters...(4) [P. 577.] You see now what great rough places there are here, how all things with you toss like waves and vacillate. You do not know that he that celebrates the mass has been baptized ; you do not know that he is a priest ; you do not know that the intention required is present in him then. Because you do not know these things, you are sure that you do not know whether the bread has now been transubstantiated : you are certain that you are worshipping and giving higher worship to that which you do not know to be God. But God is not to be worshipped from opinion but from faith. And if in other things most of all is the Apostle's rule, Rom. xiv. 13, to be held in giving the worship of the higher service.

P. 574. "A proper propitiatory sacrifice is, That which by a force of its own, without relation to any other thing, propitiates God to sinners, and by its real merit, value, price, and by the dignity of the sacrifice obtains remission of sins and God's grace. Such a sacrifice there never either was or will be except the only one of Christ, offering to God His own body and blood on the cross."

ratur : prius non esse in missâ verum et proprium sacrificium : secundum, eucharistiam adorandam non esse, et pontificios, qui eam adorant, idololâtras esse...(4) P. 577. Vides nunc quantæ hic salebræ, quam apud vos fluctuent et vacillent omnia. Nescis eum, qui missam celebrat, baptizatum esse, nescis sacerdotem esse : nescis intentionem debitam eum adesse. Quia ista nescis, certus es te nescire, an panis transubstantiatus jam sit : certus es te quod nescis colere et latrîam ei exhibere, quod Deum esse non scis. [Gerson. Comp. Theol. de trib. virt. p. III.] Deus vero ex opinione colendus non est, sed ex fide. Et si in aliis, maxime omnium in cultu latrîæ exhibendo tenenda est apostoli regula, Rom. xiv. 13...

In (1) p. 574, the definition of a true propitiatory sacrifice is, Suâ vi non relatione ad aliud habitâ, propitium Deum peccatoribus facit, exque ipso merito, valore, pretio, ac dignitate sacrificiî peccatorum remissionem et Dei gratiam obtinet [Bellarm. de Missâ, L. 2, c. 2 ; Conc. Trident. § 22, c. 2, e. 3.] Sacrificium tale nullum vel unquam fuit vel erit, præter unum Christum, corpus Suum et sanguinem in cruce Deo offerentem.

## THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

(A.) HERBERT THORNDIKE, PREBENDARY OF WESTMINSTER. D. 1672.

MASTER of Sidney, associated with Walton. Took part with Walton in his wonderful Polyglott Bible. He was Master of Sidney before the Restoration. He was Fellow of Trinity, Cambridge. He was chairman of the Savoy Conference.

*On nice disputes in Christendom.* Anglo-Cath. Lib. Vol. i. 737. "The consecration of the eucharist. Cassander, in his consultation, complains of those of the Reformation for abolishing that form, the substance of which all churches since the apostles have always used in consecrating the eucharist, being that which the Scriptures dignify by the title of blessing and thanksgiving, from whence the sacrament itself is called the sacrament of the eucharist or thanksgiving, and sometimes absolutely without any addition the eucharist.....This reproof seconded by Grotius, III. 625, De Missâ. Dr Revet rejoins that the Church of England hath ever preserved the same entire...How shall any common sense be satisfied,...whether he—the minister—hath consecrated the same or not ?

*Of the laws of the Church*, Vol. iv. p. 753. "The adoration of the eucharist, which the church of Rome presenteth, is not necessarily idolatry. I say not what it may be accidentally by that intention which some may conceal, and may make it idolatry, as to God...I speak upon a supposition of that intention which the church, &c. I suppose them to believe that those creatures of God which are the elements of that sacrament *are not* there more after the consecration ; having ceased to be, that they might make room for the body and blood of the Lord to come into their stead. I suppose that the body and blood of Christ *may be adored* by a good Christian *when the custom of the church requires it*.

P. 754. "I suppose further that the body and blood of Christ is not adored nor to be adored by Christians neither for itself, nor for any endowment residing in it, which it may have received

from being personally united with the Godhead of Christ, but only in consideration of the Godhead to which it remains inseparably united. [The Church of England of which Thorndike was a member, said then, as it does now, that adoration is not to be paid to any corporal presence, *i.e.* to any (supposed) corporal presence of Christ's flesh and blood; and that such adoration is idolatry. Thorndike teaches that it is right to pay adoration to the (assumed) presence of Christ's flesh and blood in consideration of its inseparable union with the Godhead. I. How the teaching of Thorndike and the Church's declaration can agree, I do not see. II. The inseparable union of Christ's Deity with His manhood does not make the human body present everywhere, as the Deity of Christ is, and III. The Church expressly says that there is no presence of Christ's natural body on earth at all, but that it is only in Heaven; and these words either imply that Christ's body is *now* in its natural state, *ψυχικὸν σῶμα*, and not yet in its spiritual and glorious state, or else they include the glorified body under the term "natural body"—in which case the Church of England affirms that Christ's glorified body is in Heaven only, and not on earth either in the sacrament or (ordinarily) on any other occasion. IV. As the Church says *both* that adoration may not be paid to *any corporal presence*, and that Christ's *natural* body is in Heaven and not here, it may I think be concluded that "natural body" and "corporeal presence of Christ's body" are equivalent terms.] The Godhead of Christ is the thing that is honoured, and the reason why *it* is honoured. The body and blood of Christ, though it be necessarily honoured because necessarily united to that which is honoured, yet is *it* not the only thing that is honoured, and the reason why it is honoured, speaking of the honour proper to God alone...Is not the presence in the sacrament of the eucharist a just occasion to express by the bodily act of adoration that inward honour which we always feel to our Lord Jesus Christ, as God? [The one conclusive answer to all this is that if the bread and wine are figures or signs of Christ's death, Christ is not in them, and therefore *they may not be adored*, as it would be idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians: and further that the body and blood of Christ are not there, but in Heaven only, and they cannot be adored in their absence as far off as Heaven is from earth. Adoration implies the presence of its object. God can anywhere be adored, as everywhere present.]

*An Epilogue, &c.* 1. The principles of Christian truth. P. 35, c. VI. "The authority of the church as the reason of believing taken away [because its recital of the miracles is rather the occasion of our believing than the reason, *i.e.* the church's witness furnishes the opportunity to believe which might have been otherwise supplied]—it remains that we affirm, whatsoever

the whole church from the beginning hath received and practised for the rule of faith and manners, all that to be evidently true by the same reason for which we believe the Scriptures. [Surely we must say *distinguo*. If this refer to a period including the time of the presence of Christ or of His inspired apostles it is true: but if the period begin after the inspired direction had ceased, then there might be catholic uniformity in support of an error of doctrine or of practice. A better instance than this of the Lord's supper can hardly be desired; for from uninspired Clement of Rome downwards for many ages it was the received doctrine that the Lord's supper is "an offering." That is an error in doctrine, *viz.* that we offer the bread and wine to God: at least it is not in holy Writ: and the regulation of the public service upon this doctrine is an error in practice which would seem to be from the same early origin. This alien germ has swelled and expanded and grown up exceedingly from age to age; Ignatius added the word altar and Justin the word sacrifice; but the living principle is one and the same; *viz.* that the Lord's supper is something more than a feast, upon a sacrifice that has been previously and independently offered: now no consent of the uninspired church from Clement onwards makes this evidently true for us to hold. Also the importance of disproving this is of vital consequence. For see what follows from it in Mr Thorndike's hands.] And therefore, that the meaning of them (the Scriptures) is necessarily to be confined within those bounds; so that nothing must be admitted for the truth of them (the Scriptures) which contradicteth the same. [If this hold true private judgment must cease. Protestantism loses its basis. Chillingworth must be reputed a misleader: and among other works that deserve to be borne away by some justifying hurricane into the paradise of fools must be this present attempt to bring back general opinion upon this sacrament to the dicta in the holy Scriptures after considering all that other authorities have said and independently of all that they can say. Church authorities in successive ages may aid us in escaping from the weakness of ignorance but they are not the authoritative expounders of the words of holy Scripture. The principle of Thorndike's great work is that they are. It was necessary to draw attention to this, since also a leading dignitary has lately brought forward this principle in the words "Such and such a doctrine is "*patristic* and therefore Anglican," *i.e.* universally binding on churchmen in England. Has this school rightful standing ground in any reformed church?]

Vol. v. 181. "That which goes before the offertory belongs not properly to the second service according to a primitive form; *for the presenting of the elements* was always the beginning of it. It is called a preface in a very ancient African Canon, to wit to the consecration of the elements that follows, which, as I said before,

is nothing else but a prayer that God would send the Holy Ghost upon the present elements and make them the body and blood of Christ, that they who should reverence them worthily might be filled with His grace. The common prayers of the church were always made at the altar or communion table in the act of the sacrament. Reason good. How can Christians think their prayers so effectual with God, as when they are presented at the commemoration of the sacrifice of Christ crucified?"

His great work is published London, 1619, as "An Epilogue to  
"the tragedy of the Church of England, being a consideration and  
"brief resolution of the chief controversies in religion that divide  
"the Western Church: occasioned by the present calamity of the  
"Church of England, in three books, (1) The principles of Chris-  
"tian truth, (2) The covenant of grace, (3) The laws of the Church,  
"&c., and are to be sold at the sign of the Bell in St Paul's  
"Church-yard."

#### (B.) DAUGHTER OF DAVID CLARKSON.

In addition to the case of good old Philip Henry I ask what is the conclusion to be drawn from the following case—that of the married daughter of David Clarkson, Fellow and Tutor of Clare Hall in the seventeenth century? The lady was evidently endowed with a mind of no common order, and enriched with deep religious emotions. In the preface to Clarkson's works (Nicol's Edition, Edinburgh) she appears writing thus,

"Thus after many conflicts comforts and supports I determined to give myself up to some church, *that I might partake of the Lord's supper* and have my faith confirmed in the blood of that everlasting covenant, which I hoped the Lord had made with me, since He had given me His Spirit as the earnest thereof. I accordingly was joined to a church, and, in coming to this ordinance found great delight: *my faith was strengthened and my love increased* from that sweet communion which I then enjoyed with my Lord by His blessed Spirit: who often filled me with joy unspeakable and full of glory. Then I walked under the sweet and comfortable sense of His love; and, *whilst in the way of duty*, I was thus indulged with such sights of the Redeemer's glory and such a taste of His grace, I frequently wished that I might never go back to the world again."

On this extract I add two remarks: the first, that Canon Liddon will perceive the highest affection to the Lord's supper and its benefits, without a shadow of superstition as to the Bodily Presence: the second, that, as in the coming extracts from Zwingel in the Third Part, the benefits spring from increase in *faith, love and a sense of duty*.

(C.) ARCHBISHOP JAMES USHER. B. 1580. D. 1655.

A man to wonder at—not only for his precocious and well-used enormous talents, but also on account of the singular Providential incidents that went before and followed upon their appearance, and that worked to develope them to the full. Indeed if belief in a Divine superintending care were not indisputably taught by implication throughout God's Scriptures, it might be established by generalizing from such instances as stand out in Usher's life by his chaplain, Dr Richard Parr. I must pass many points and note but a few. Such are his having a Romanist uncle by his mother's side, who was a noted historian; his having female relatives of noted piety, who were endowed with very remarkable memories, and who, though blind, taught him English; and his having a brother Ambrose who was really great in Hebrew and other Oriental literature. Let us pass to two more singular things. James Hamilton, a much more eminent scholar than any in Dublin at that time, was sent to that city from Scotland in the interest of King James, to prepare the Irish for his inheritance of the British crown. He was required to conceal his mission: so with his colleague James Fullarton he took the profession of a preceptor of young men; and thus he came to teach Usher. Then when Usher was approaching a riper age, in the year 1593, Trinity College, Dublin, is opened just in time for Usher to enter, and James Hamilton is made Senior Fellow. Then what fruit springs from these felicitous conjunctures! Usher's course is first marked by a striking instance of self-denial. In 1598 he inherited his deceased father's considerable estate: and he was proof against the temptation to relinquish his laborious studies: and he gave the bulk of the property to the rest of the family, reserving only so much as would be needed for his maintenance and to supply him with books. Then at 21 he became famous by triumphing in an



open contest with a Jesuit on behalf of the Protestant religion, and he did this with such grace and candour as to win the affection of his adversary. It was not long before he was forced prematurely to take holy orders on account of his acknowledged fitness at that age to preach both to the Court and to the University. All his career is a succession of triumphs: and we may add to this that he won an equal triumph over pride. But I pause from praising him—I am no Irishman nor in any degree of Irish blood. But it seems to me that one might almost say of him, What theological subject did he not touch, and what that he touched did he not illumine? But our point is that he stands among the first for reasoning closely and elaborately about the circumstantial details and words of Scripture in relation to the Lord's supper: and for a long time one may search without finding anything in him which the closest Protestant investigator would not subscribe to and adopt. Indeed were it not for a little writing like that in his very early controversy with the Jesuit, which may easily be condoned, he stands almost the first among the few who on this delicate subject have been best and simplest and most Scriptural. The true name of Usher was Neville, but an ancestor who became usher to King John, according to the frequent custom of the time adopted the title of his office as his own name. It is plain that there has never been another Usher. Will so many singular felicities again concur to a man of so remarkable mental power? Belonging to no country he is of the heritage of the world.

*Usher's Works.* Dublin, 1847.

Part of the evidence that can be brought in relation to Usher's opinion on this sacrament is from "The Articles of religion agreed upon... in the Convocation Dublin 1615," Vol. I. Appendix, Art. 92—100, p. xlix. It is reasonably assumed that Usher, present as Bishop of Meath, had much to do with their construction. The English articles are their basis: but much is added, sometimes with all the freedom of a running commentary. Either they give tone to much that he afterwards wrote on this subject, or else he gave them much of his own particular thoughts on this sacrament.

92. "The Lord's supper is not only a sign of the mutual love, which Christians ought to bear towards one another, but much more a sacrament of our preservation in the church, sealing unto

us our spiritual nourishment and continual growth in Christ. 93. The change of the substance of bread and wine into the substance of the body and blood of Christ, commonly called transubstantiation, cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but is repugnant to plain testimonies of the Scripture, &c., &c. 94. In the outward part, the body and blood of Christ is in a most lively manner represented, being no otherwise present with the visible elements, than things signified and sealed are present with the signs and seals, that is to say symbolically and relatively. But in the inward and spiritual part the same body is really and substantially presented unto all those who have grace to receive the Son of God, even to all that believe His name. [This is not distinguishable from the most ancient and reasonable sense of consubstantiation, that which enters not into the question whether Christ's real and substantial body is received by the mouth or by the heart. It involves the ubiquity of Christ's body, in so far as it must be present wherever faithful communicants are receiving it.] And unto such as in this manner do worthily and with faith repair unto the Lord's table the body and blood of Christ is not only signified and offered, but also truly exhibited and communicated. [95, 96, and 98. Three of our Articles. 97 is against communion in one kind. 99 is against offering the mass for the remission of pain or guilt.] 100. Private masses, *i.e.* the receiving of the eucharist by the priest alone, without a competent number of communicants, is contrary to the institution of Christ. Decree. If any... teach... contrary, &c., let him be silenced and deprived of all spiritual promotions he doth enjoy.

*Sermon before the House of Commons, 1620. Vol. II. p. 427.*

"A sacrament taken in its full extent comprehendeth two things in it; that which is outward and visible, which the schools call properly *sacramentum* in a more strict acceptation of the word; and that which is inward and invisible, which they term *rem sacramenti*, the principal thing exhibited in the sacrament. [This word "exhibited" is Calvin's favourite word, not meaning displayed and made visible, but furnished and supplied.] Thus in the Lord's supper the outward thing, which we see with our eyes, is bread and wine; the inward thing, which we apprehend by faith, is the body and blood of Christ. In the outward part of this mystical action, which reacheth to that which is *sacramentum* only [*i.e.* the sacred sign], we receive this body and blood but sacramentally [*i.e.* only in the sign or figure]: in the inward, that containeth *rem*, the thing itself in it, we receive them [*i.e.* the body and blood] really, and consequently the presence of these in the one [*i.e.* in the outward part] is relative and symbolical; in the other [in the inward part] really substantial.

This then is Usher's first utterance that the body of Christ is present in a substantial manner, *i.e.* as a substance, in a real manner, as well as figuratively, in (or with) the bread and wine. See also pp. 429 and 431.—The preface to the Answer to a Jesuit, London, 1686. The Fourth Edition refers to p. 17, where Usher gives its date as 54 years later than Pope Pius IV.'s Bull, 1564, *i.e.* 1618. The Body of Divinity was published six years later, in 1624. A letter from Usher to Mr Downham, its editor, Vol. I. p. 249, renounces "The Catechism" that he writes of "as not his, "but transcribed from Mr Cartwright's Catechism and Mr Crook's "and some other English divines, but drawn together in one "method as a kind of common place book, where other men's "judgments and reasons are strongly laid down, though not ap- "proved in all places by the collector, &c., &c." And yet many editions were published with the primate's name: and to this day it is marked in catalogues, as in Darling's, as "Usher's Body "of Divinity." In Usher's "Principles of the Christian Religion," Vol. xi. 194, dated 1564, the Lord's supper is called, "The sacra- "ment of our preservation in the church, sealing unto us our "spiritual nourishment and continual increase in Christ, &c." But nothing is said of receiving His body "substantially" or "really." In the sermons, which are not entirely Usher's own, is one on 1 Cor. xi. 29, Vol. xiii. Perhaps Usher is more nearly responsible for these than for the Body of Divinity. So in fairness I cite a little.

"Christ hath been crucified, not by hear-say only, but in the blessed sacrament, wherein He is represented as if His soul were before our eyes poured out unto death, so that by these sacraments Heavenly things are as it were clothed in earthly garments...Christ doth thus by His sacrament [as Absalom by erecting a pillar], and erects it as a monument for the remembrance of His death [see extracts from Tyndal], and as it were calls it by His own name, saying, This is My body and This is My blood, that whenever we see them we may call to mind Christ offered for us and to us...It helps our understanding by being a sign, and is a confirmation, a seal, by virtue of which Christ is passed and made over to us, so that we have as true an interest and right to Him as to our meat and drink: yea He becomes as effectually ours, for every purpose in our spiritual life, as our meat and drink doth for our corporal. To which end these elements are changed spiritually in their natures: not in substance [Thus Usher seems here to deny that Christ's body is "substantially

present"], but in use; so that which was but now a common bread, becomes as far different as Heaven from earth, being altered in its use [and more to the same purport]. It is an instrument whereby Christ instates me into Himself and whereby I have fellowship and communion with Him...If any man...eat...unworthily,...what was ordained to life and appointed to be a seal and confirmation of God's love and favour, is now changed and become a seal and confirmation of God's anger and indignation...he discerns not the Lord's body and blood, but takes them as ordinary things, deeming the elements not different from the bread and wine which we have at our tables, not knowing that they are the dishes, wherein Christ is served in to us; that by these the greatest gift is given to us and nourishment conveyed for the maintenance of our spiritual life." [No date is set to this sermon; but the tone of it is very manifestly different from his earlier assertion, that Christ's body is present in a real and substantial manner. When he meant to say that, Usher added the word "substantial" to "real." When our church wished to speak of it in order to deny it she said, i.e. Cranmer said, "The real natural body of Christ." Is it not a matter of regret that she, i.e. Dean Overall, has written "The body and blood of Christ which are verily and indeed" (the English words for *vere et realiter*) "received by the faithful in "the Lord's supper"? For if they be not really and substantially there, neither faithful nor unfaithful do receive them in that supper.]

*Body of Divinity.* London, 1677.

P. 399. "He was to administer it after supper—because it was to come in lieu and stead of the passover—and that it might go immediately before His passion, those outward elements of bread and wine, signifying Christ and Him crucified, with all the benefits of His death and passion—even whole Christ with all the fruits of His mediation...He took both bread and wine that He might shew how plentiful and assured redemption we have in Christ, Whom these represent...It was indeed unleavened bread because no other was then lawful...They (the bread and wine) are *not changed in nature, but in use*: for the words of eating and drinking properly belong to the outward elements, and *by a borrowed speech* do *improperly* belong to the body and blood of Christ—to note unto us the communion we have with our Saviour Christ of Whom we are *verily partakers* by a lively faith, as of the bread and wine by eating and drinking them. And thus we say that these elements are changed because, being separate from a common use, they are consecrate to sign and seal to us our spiritual nourishment and growth, by the body and blood of Christ Jesus. For as the sacrament of baptism doth seal to us spiritual regeneration, so the Lord's supper a spiritual feeding...

Therefore the bread and wine are not the true body and blood of Christ, but the signs and tokens of them: as in baptism the water was only a sign of Christ's blood and not the blood...(1) If the bread were turned into Christ, there would be two Christs. One that giveth, another that is given; for one Saviour Christ gave the bread. (2) If the bread be the very body of Christ there should then be no sign of the thing signified, and so no sacrament. (3) The wicked receiver might then eat and drink Christ's body and blood as well as any true believer. (4) The minister cannot give the inward grace, but the outward element... *What reason was there to move our Saviour Christ to such a borrowed speech?* Because it is...usual in the Scripture to give the name of the thing signed and signified to the sign; as *the tree of life* which was only the sign of life, circumcision the covenant, which was only the token of the covenant; the lamb or kid the passover, whereof it was a sign only...baptism is called the new birth or washing away of sins *whereof it is only a seal*. But some say [Luther and others] but nothing is impossible with God. The question is here not of the power, but of the will of God...How are the bread and wine consecrated? By doing that, which at the first consecration Christ did. What does that signify? That God in His due time sent Christ into the world and sanctified Him... that those outward signs of bread and wine might through the operation of the Holy Spirit *be effectual* for the purposes they were ordained unto...There is no mention of these things in the evangelists; but it must needs be granted that He, on other occasions as well as on this, gave *thanks and prayed, in words* proportionable to the *prayers and thanks* here used (*i.e.* the blessing and thanksgiving). For, taking the barley loaves and fishes and giving thanks (and blessing), what can be understood but that He, giving thanks to God, that had given these creatures for the bodily nourishment, prayed that He would bless them and *make them effectual* to that purpose and end? And as it is not lawful to eat the common meat and drink without such prayer and thanksgiving, so is it not lawful to communicate these elements without thanksgiving and prayer...To eat the bread and drink the wine...What does that signify? Our uniting unto Christ and enjoying of Him. That we must with delight apply Christ and His merits to all the necessities of our soul, spiritually feeding upon Him and growing by Him...And as God doth bless these outward elements to preserve and strengthen the body of the receiver, so Christ, apprehended and received by faith, doth nourish him and preserve both body and soul unto eternal life...Christ's body and blood be offered by God to all, yet are they received by such only as have the hand of faith to lay hold on Christ; and these with the bread and wine spiritually receive Christ with all His saving graces. The wicked receive only the outward elements.

...The special end and uses, for which the Lord's supper was ordained...To call to mind and renew the virtue of Christ's death.

I might with reason omit the following extracts from Usher, as the work was written before he was of age. I might do this on the plea that it contains not his matured opinions on the Lord's supper, but rather those which he at first took partly at secondhand before he was old enough to arrive at well-considered conclusions, which are given in the extracts already made. But I much prefer that the earlier utterance should be fully reported lest the evidence should seem to be imperfect and biassed, so as not to run straightforward. My object is to promote not evangelical traditions so much as evangelical truth: or rather, to speak more accurately still, I wish to indicate what is the truth of the Gospel in reference to this great subject of the holy supper of the Lord. I am sensible that I may err through human imperfections, but I would fain keep my aim true.

*Answer to the Challenge made by a Jesuit in Ireland.*  
London, 1686.

P. 30. "Of the real presence. In the receiving of the blessed sacrament we are to distinguish between the outward and the inward action of the communicant. In the outward with our bodily mouth we receive really the visible elements of bread and wine; in the inward we do by faith really receive the body and blood of our Lord. [How Usher can even thus adopt this confusing form of words astonishes me! The 6th of John it is true gives us Christ's words, My flesh is truly food and My blood is truly drink: but Jesus clearly meant that it was such not in the real natural form but typically in a wholly different way from the bread or manna. He says the flesh profiteth not at all, meaning in the real natural form. When then Usher has just said, We receive really the bread and wine, how can he in the same breath say we do, by faith, really receive the body and blood? It seems less excusable (1) because real body is constantly used in the controversy in the sense of natural body, and (2) the Church of England and Ireland used "real natural" in that sense and (3) what means the discussion of this chapter "on the real presence" if the term real is to be used by us regarding Christ's presence not in the real natural form, just as it is used by the Roman communion to express that bodily presence which we above all things deny? How common is it to this day to hear it said by some, Both England and Rome hold the real presence. What can be more inexact and inexpedient and dangerous? The very thing we left

Rome for is this real natural presence.] That is to say (We) are truly and indeed made partakers of Christ crucified to the spiritual strengthening of our inward man. They of the adverse part have made such a confusion of these things that for the first they utterly deny that after the words of consecration there remaineth any bread or wine at all to be received. [But if any man believes Christ's body present in its true natural form *as well as* in the bread in a figure he is so far a consubstantialist.] And for the second do affirm that the body and blood of Christ is in such a manner present under the outward shows of bread and wine that whosoever receiveth the one (be he good or bad, believer or unbeliever) doth therewith really receive the other. [Here Usher useth really in the sense of in the "real natural" form. Why not keep to this sense for clearness' sake, as well because "really" best stands for "in re ipsâ;" and what is the *res ipsa* of all the discussion between Rome and England, but the body and its real natural presence? No one discusses or doubts the presence of Christ's Divinity. It is superfluous to call that a real presence. No one thinks *that* metaphorical. And again as to Rome's explanation that Christ's body is there shorn of its perceptible qualities, that is not a real natural presence, but a very unnatural and unreal presence indeed.]

P. 31. "That this sermon [in John vi.] was uttered by our Saviour above a year before the celebration of His last supper, wherein the sacrament of His body and blood was instituted, at which time none of His hearers could possibly have understood Him to have spoken of the external eating of Him in the sacrament. Thirdly that by the eating of the flesh of Christ and the drinking of His blood is not here meant an external eating or drinking with the mouth and throat of the body (as the Jews then and the Romanists, far more grossly than they, have since imagined) but an internal and a spiritual, effected by a lively faith and the quickening Spirit of Christ in the soul of the believer, for 'there is a spiritual mouth of the inner man, &c., &c.' as St Basil saith. [There is such a mouth in a figure but no real mouth, and so Christ's flesh or body is eaten, *i.e.* it is eaten in a figure only.] Fourthly, That this spiritual feeding upon the body and blood of Christ is not to be found in the sacrament only, but also out of the sacrament. Fifthly, That the eating of the flesh and the drinking of the blood here mentioned is of such excellent virtue, that the receiver is thereby made to remain in Christ and Christ in him, and by that means certainly freed from death and assured of everlasting life. Which, seeing it cannot be verified of the eating of the sacrament (whereof both the godly and the wicked are partakers) it proveth not only that our Saviour did not here speak of the sacramental eating: but further also that the thing which is delivered in the external part of the sacrament

cannot be conceived to be really, but sacramentally only, the flesh and blood of Christ. [Then why did Usher say before, p. 30, we really receive the body and blood of Christ? He was young when he held this controversy. That which is delivered in the external part of it must needs mean that which is handed to the recipient by the minister, *i.e.* that which is partaken of visibly and externally and in which the external participation of the feast consists. If anything *were* added afterwards (*viz.* Christ's real body) that would be no part of the visible ordinance appointed, and would not help in getting out the force of This is My body. But as sacramental means in a sign, *i.e.* in a figure, it is directly opposed to really. Sacramental eating as opposed to real eating can only bear this sense. It is in fact only a church term for eating "in a figure": as Abraham's son Isaac was said to be offered up or slain in sacrifice.]

P. 32. John vi. 55, "My flesh is meat indeed (Gk. true meat) &c." "We willingly indeed acknowledge that that which is inwardly presented in the Lord's supper and spiritually received by the soul of the faithful, is that very thing which is treated of in John vi., but we deny that it was our Saviour's intention in this place to speak of that which is *externally delivered* in the sacrament and orally received by the communicant.

V. 53. "Except ye eat, &c." "An obligation laid upon them for doing this [which in no likelihood could be intended of the external eating, &c.] but also an absolute necessity imposed 'non *præcepti solum ratione sed etiam medii.*' Now to hold that all they are excluded from life which have not had the means to receive the sacrament of the Lord's supper is as untrue as it is uncharitable. And therefore many of the Papists themselves, Biel, Cusanus, Cajetan, Tapper, Hessels, Jansenius [which? or both?] and others confess that our Saviour, John vi., did not properly treat of the sacrament. [But this text is frequently urged as requiring infant communion.]

On vv. 51, 54, 56, 58. "Whereon Origen on Matt. xv. rightly observeth that the difference is between the eating of the typical and symbolical [for so he calleth the sacrament] and the true body of Christ.

P. 37. "The like difference doth S. Aug. shew between the eating of Christ's body sacramentally and really, Civ. Dei, 21, 25, and John T. 26. Which distinction between the sacrament and the thing whereof it is a sacrament (and consequently between the sacramental and the real eating of the body of Christ) is expressed in John T. 26 ... Our conclusion therefore is this. The body and blood of Christ is received by all unto life and by none unto condemnation. But that substance which is outwardly delivered in the sacrament is not received by all unto life, but by many unto



condemnation. Therefore that substance which is outwardly delivered in the sacrament is not really the body and blood of Christ. [Note. This degree of accuracy of language answers well against all who believe in a change of the bread and wine on the table, *i.e.* before the elements are given and received : but greater accuracy is indispensable when you have to deal with those who hold that Christ's "real natural" body and blood find entrance into our bodies and cause great bodily benefit, or with those who hold that His real natural body and blood are given to our souls and cause great spiritual benefit. To both these errors the language of Usher, Hooker, &c., often lies open.]

P. 38. "The reader may be pleased to consider (1) that the words are not 'This shall be My body' nor 'This is made or shall be changed into My body,' but 'This is My body.' (2) That the word 'This' can have relation to no other substance but that which was then present when our Saviour spake the word, which (as we shall make it plainly appear) was bread. (3) That, it being proved that the word 'This' doth demonstrate the bread, it must of necessity follow that Christ affirming that to be His 'body' cannot be conceived to have meant it to be so properly, but relatively and sacramentally. [O si sic omnia dixisset! "Sacramentally" is "in a sign." But as the figurative language used by our Lord and Paul, is used by so many ad libitum without a turn of language to shew that they mean only the sacramental or sign-sense, their language has ever helped those who take the language in its literal or "real natural" sense, and is constantly appealed to by them accordingly. It must not be forgotten that, as the thing has been and is and ever will be so much disputed, it becomes necessary not only (1) on the one hand to explain Christ's language as Usher does here, but (2) on the other hand to beware of using language, in explaining the words of Christ and Paul, which will throw men back into the great and vital misinterpretation, against which Jesus has especially warned us in John vi.; and (3) it is to be remembered the word "real" is never used in the New Testament in the figurative expressions of eating Christ's body and drinking His blood. So at least we ought to avoid using that word ambiguously, and thus giving occasion for such self-contradictions of speech as "real spiritual," &c.]

P. 39. "The whole matter of difference resteth now upon the second point, Whether our Saviour when He said 'This is My body' meant anything to be His body but that bread which was before Him... For what did He demonstrate [shew] here and said was His body but that which He 'gave unto' His disciples? What did He give unto them but what He 'brake'? what brake He but what He 'took'? and doth not the text expressly say that He 'took bread'? Was it not therefore of the bread that He said

'This is My body'? And could bread have been otherwise possibly understood to have been His 'body' but as a sacrament [or sacred sign] and as He Himself with His own breath declared His own meaning to be, a memorial of Himself? [In this Greek-loving age it is generally denied that *ἀνάμνησις* here means "a memorial" and it is asserted that *εἰς τὴν Ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν* means "for My remembrance," i.e. to promote the remembering of Me.] If it be said that S. Paul by bread doth not here understand that which is properly bread, but that which lately was bread but now is become the body of Christ, we must remember that S. Paul doth not only say 'The bread' but 'The bread which we break,' which 'breaking,' being an accident properly belonging to 'the bread' itself and not to the 'body' of Christ, which being in glory cannot be subject to any more 'breaking,' doth evidently shew that the apostle by 'bread' meant bread indeed. Neither can the Romanists well deny this, while they have imagined, that the change of the bread into the body of Christ is made by virtue of the sacramental words alone, which have not their effect until they have all been fully uttered."

As is shewn in many extracts the great difficulty of the advocates of a real natural bodily presence is the chronology of the separate acts which the words record. After taking bread our Lord (1) blessed, (2) brake, (3) gave and (4) said "This is My body," so that it was bread and bread only when He began to give it, and by analogy it is bread and bread only, when the priest begins to give it, if he were to follow our Lord exactly: for if saying "This is My body," and no more, caused the wonderful change, this change did not take place until after it had begun to be given by our Lord and received by the disciples; and the same would hold with real-presence-priests if they followed our Lord's example in these minutiae, which of course they ought to do. But as seen by means of our extracts they not only change the order of these acts but try to make out that the Evangelists have stated the matter wrongly, i.e. that the Evangelists have not given the details in the true order—because (they say) our Saviour could not have done these several acts in the order in which the Evangelists represent Him to have done them. See Bellarmine, Durand de Porcain, Cajetan, &c.

It will not avail for any advocate of the priests of the real presence to turn round upon us and say, You also do wrong, for you too pronounce the words "This is My body" before the bread is begun to be given by you to the recipient, for in our case who attach no such power to the utterance of those words, and do not

believe in any "real" change, the order of the several acts of Christ does not seem to be of any consequence: but with real-presence-priests the order is of the highest significance, as their most acute advocates acknowledge and maintain, and even accuse the evangelists of inaccuracy in their narratives on account of it. For, to recapitulate, if we have a correct account through St Matthew in the words, xxvi. 26, *Λαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν ἄρτον καὶ εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς*, and through St Mark's *λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασε καὶ ἔδωκεν* and in St Luke's *λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς*, and in St Paul's *ἔλαβεν ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν*, and if in all these four accounts *καὶ εἶπε, Λάβετε, φάγετε, τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά Μου* of St Matth.; and *καὶ εἶπεν, Λάβετε, τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά Μου* of St Mark; and *λέγων, Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά Μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον* of St Luke; and *καὶ εἶπεν, Τοῦτό Μου ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν* of St Paul; if I say all these four several accounts of the saying of the words "This is My body" come after the four several accounts of the taking the blessing and giving thanks and of the breaking and the beginning of the giving, then it follows (1) that Christ had nothing, when He began to give it, beyond bread, and that even a real-presence-priest, if he follows Christ, has nothing beyond bread in his hand when he begins &c. whether any change takes place afterwards or not.

One thing more should be said. I have written as if St Luke's expression, *ἔδωκε λέγων*, and He gave, saying, "This is My body," and St Matthew's expression *ἐδίδου καὶ εἶπε*, He proceeded to give and said, may be taken to mean that Christ said the words "This is My body" while He was giving the bread individually to each. But in all the four narratives Christ took, and blessed or gave thanks, and brake, before He gave the bread to the disciples; and therefore there was nothing but bread in His hands when He began to give it, and so by analogy ought it to be with every real-presence-priest. Therefore the breaking is breaking bread only, and the change if any change would take place after the breaking, and either at the close of the words "This is My body," or at the very earliest during their utterance, and not while the bread was on the table; and therefore the table could not be rightly called an altar, because it would not have Christ's body and blood upon it, except indeed what was reserved, if any.

I do not know that such so-called priests would deem it

objectionable to suppose the change to take place in the act of giving the bread to the people: but at any rate, all real-presence services must be reformed to agree with the order of our Saviour's acts by all who believe the inspired narratives correct in these particulars.

(D.) BISHOP JOSEPH HALL, OF NORWICH. B. 1574. D. 1656.

He succeeded the sixteenth-century divines. His lot was to be contemporary and fellow-worker with the primate Laud. So his cathedral was sacked in the rebellion, as he pathetically and humorously recites in his *Hard Measure*. But *Sic vos non vobis* might have been its motto if addressed to the fallen archbishop. But there is another saying more appropriate to the case, *Sæpe Diespiter neglectus incesto addidit integrum*, The punishment for neglect often falls on the wrong back. However, the love of subsequent generations follows the memory of Joseph Hall. He is not the Christian Seneca, both because his character is unstained by wicked subservience to the great; and yet more, because Christianity gave him what heathenism could not supply to any Seneca—a large warm heart. Had Bishop Hall's prose been twice as much, it would all have been read and prized for its racy peculiarity and evangelical wisdom. Besides his *Contemplations* and his other works in a similar spirit, who contends better for the faith than the writer of "*No Peace with Rome*," and "*The Honour of the Married Clergy*"? neither of which comes within the compass of our subject. It is something that Laud let him so speak out: but Laud was in many points Protestant, though it is the fashion to forget this.

*No Peace with Rome.* London, 1628.

P. 377. "Transubstantiation and the multipresence of Christ's body, neither know I which of the two I should prefer, for madness and sophistical cozenage. That the same body of Christ should be in 1000 places at once of this sublunary world, while yet it is in the meantime entire in Heaven—that the whole body of Christ should lie hid in a little thin wafer, yet so that the parts and members thereof should not one run into another, but continue distinct and severally disposed among themselves, and have a shape and order agreeable to man's body! It doth not only exceed reason, but faith...

P. 676. "That any reasonable man should believe that Christ carried His own body in one of His hands, that He brought it forth to be eaten by those holy guests of His which saw Him present with them and heard Him speaking to them, both whiles they were eating Him and when they had eaten...How mad, yea how impious is this! that they will overturn the very principles of nature, the order of things, the humanity of the Saviour, the truth of the sacrament, the constant judgment of Scripture, and lastly the very foundations of the Divinity, and confusedly jumble Heaven and earth together, rather than they will, where necessity requires it, admit but of a tropical kind of speech...That the *true* body of Christ is *truly* offered and truly received in the sacrament which of us hath not constantly taught and defended? [This is that frequent harking back on their own footsteps until, as far as the proper sense of words goes, the Reforming defenders stand again on the very Popish ground they had left. I fail to see the rightfulness of so *dissensing* received controversial expressions. Tractarians have been blamed for duplicity, when they have done it.] But how is this? Not by any bodily touch: as Cyril and Ambrose say well!! [Only read what both the Cyrils most commonly say, and Ambrose though he is far less "prononcé"], but by our faith. That it should be corporally, carnally, orally present it hath ever seemed impious to us...We like well the ingenuity of Arius Montanus. He saith, That is My body, *i.e.* sacramentally contained in the sacrament; and straight he adds like another Nicodemus, The secret and most mystical manner whereof God will once [*i.e.* one day] vouchsafe more clearly to unfold to His Christian church [a very ambiguous saying]. As Chrysostom speaks, a remembrance of a sacrifice; *i.e.* as Augustine interprets it, a memorial of Christ's passion celebrated in the church; and from the sweet communication of our redemption there arises another sacrifice, the sacrifice of praise, and from thence a true peace-offering of the Christian soul. These sacrifices offer themselves to us here; but for any propitiating sacrifice unless representative, I find none...neither indeed can there be, &c. We well remember this holy sacrifice of Christ, and celebrate it with a thankful heart. We will not repeat it. We will gladly receive our Saviour offered by Himself to His Father and offered to us by His Father. We will not offer Him to His Father. Which one point whilst we stick at (as we needs must) we are straight stricken with the thunderbolt of the anathema of Trent. Here can be therefore no possibility of peace.

*Olive Tree. Christ's Presence in the Sacrament, &c.* London, 1660.

P. 288. "Certainly there can be but two ways in which He can be imagined to be present and received, either corporally or spiritually. That He should be corporally present at once in every

part of every eucharistical element throughout the world, is such a monster of opinion, as utterly overthrows the truth of His human body, destroys the nature of a sacrament, implies a world of contradictions, baffles right reason, transcends all faith, and in short confounds Heaven and earth: as we might easily shew in all particulars if it were the drift of my discourse to meddle with those which profess themselves not ours; who yet do, no less than we, cry down the gross and Capernaïtical expression which their Pope Nicholas prescribed to Berengarius, and cannot but confess that their own Cardinal Bellarmine advises, this phrase of Christ's *corporal* presence should be *very sparingly and warily taken up* in the hearing of their people. But my intention only is to satisfy those sons of the church who, disclaiming from all opinion of transubstantiation, do yet willingly *embrace a kind of irresolution* in this point as holding it safest not to enquire into *the manner* of Christ's presence...When all is said, nothing can be more clear than that in respect of bodily presence the Heavens must contain the glorified humanity of Christ till His return to judgment. As therefore the angel could say to the devout Maries after His resurrection seeking for Him in His grave, 'He is risen, 'He is not here,' so they still say to us seeking His glorious body here below, 'He is ascended, He is not here.' It should absolutely lose the nature of a human body if it were not circumscribable. Glorification [if it be glorified] doth not bereave of the truth of being what it is. It is a true human body, and therefore can no more (according to the natural being of a body glorified) be many wheres at once, than according to His personal being it can be separated from that Godhead which is at once everywhere. Let it therefore be firmly settled in our souls as an undoubted truth, that the human body of Christ in respect of corporal presence is in Heaven; whither He visibly ascended, and where He sits on the right hand of the Father, and whence He shall come again with glory—a parcel of our creed which the church learned of the angels in Mount Olivet, who taught the gazing disciples that this same Jesus, which was taken up from them into Heaven, shall so come in like manner as they saw Him go into Heaven, which was with wonderful glory and magnificence. Far be it from us then to think that the blessed humanity of the Son of God should so disparage itself as, where there is *neither necessity nor use* of a bodily descent, to steal down and convey Himself insensibly from Heaven to earth daily, and to hide up His whole sacred body in an hundred thousand several pixes at once. It is wonder that superstition itself is not ashamed of so absurd and impossible a fancy; which it is vain for men to think they can solve up with a pretence of omnipotence. We question not the power of God, but His will; and do *well know* He cannot will absolute contradictions—Deus hoc potenter non

potest, as one said truly. That, which we say of Christ's presence, holds no less of His *reception*; for so do we receive Him unto us, *as He is present* with us: neither can we corporally receive that which is bodily absent: although besides the common incongruity of opinion, the corporal receiving of Christ hath in it a further prodigiousness and horror. All the novices of the Roman schools are now ashamed of their pope's '*Dentibus teritur*;' but when their doctors have made the best of their own tenet, they cannot avoid St Augustin's '*Flagitium videtur præcipere*.' By how much the human flesh is and ought to be more dear, by so much the more odious is the thought of eating it. Neither let them imagine they can escape the imputation of an hateful savageness in this act, for that it is not presented to them in the form of flesh; whiles *they profess to know it is so*, howsoever it appeareth... Corporally then to eat (if it were possible) the flesh of Christ, as it could, in our Saviour's own word, '*profit nothing*,' so it could be no other than a kind of religious cannibalism, which *both nature and grace* cannot but justly rise against. Since therefore the body of Christ *cannot be said* to be corporally present, it must needs follow that there is no way of His presence or receipt in the sacrament but spiritual, which the church hath laboured so fully to express... There is no one point of Divine truth which she hath more punctually and plainly laid down before us, &c. &c.

P. 294. "But to put all scruples out of the mind of any reader concerning this point—let that serve for the upshot of all which is expressly set down in the 5th rubric in the end of the communion set forth as the judgment of the Church of England both in King Edward's time, and in Queen Elizabeth's time, though *lately upon negligence omitted in the impression* [*i.e.* the rubric on kneeling].

P. 295. "Thus the Church of England, having plainly explicated herself, hath left no place for any doubt concerning this truth. Neither is she any changeling in her judgment, *however some unsteady minds may vary in their conceits*. Away then with those *nice scruples*, who with some further ends have endeavoured to keep us in suspense, with a '*non licet inquirere de modo*' [it is not a lawful thing to make search concerning *the manner* in which Christ's body is present], and conclude we resolutely, that there is no truth in divinity more clear than this of Christ's gracious exhibition [Calvin's favourite word] and our faithful [*i.e.* believing] reception of Him in this blessed sacrament. Babes, keep yourselves from idols."

(E.) CORNELIUS JANSEN, BISHOP OF YPRES. B. 1585. D. 1638.

He conceived the idea of checking the Jesuits in their dominion over French minds by reproducing Augustine, or rather the essence of that father's views. He lived to finish his volume, but left it as his legacy to his friend, Du Vergier, Abbot of St Cyran, with whom through life he had taken sweet counsel as a brother, though he was of plebeian stock and his friend a decided French patrician, as his name Du Vergier de Hauranne sufficiently indicates. But the works of both the friends, of their greater follower Antoine Arnauld, have almost been trodden out of notice under the iron heel of that unscrupulous order. Nevertheless for a time Jansenius had open representatives in the Church of France; and real Augustinian piety does not even now lose sight of his works, or fail to get light and warmth from their holy pages: but hardly has Spain itself seemed to have greater difficulty in escaping from Jesuit rule than France: and perhaps the great struggle is not yet come.

There is another Cornelius Jansenius nearly 100 years earlier, who attended the Trent Council as Bishop of Ghent: but our Jansenius has overshadowed him. Singularly enough the earlier was Professor at Louvain, and the latter Principal of the College of Pulcheria in the same city. But the connexion with Augustine's opinions distinguishes our writer, who was twice visited with the Papal condemnation: the last time specifically when the Jesuits with great effort succeeded in procuring the condemnation of 15 selected propositions, in 1653. After that, all was over, as they constituted a test which no Jansenist could refuse. More is said about Jesuit persecution in the short sketch preceding our very important extracts from two of the works of the great Sorbonne doctor Antoine Arnauld, whose entire works fill about 50 quarto volumes. But to return to our Cornelius Jansenius; those who try to believe that nothing heretical could come from Augustine's pen have to explain how this our divine the most Augustinian of Augustinians, with so acute an understanding in many respects, entertained and defended such strongly anti-Scriptural views on the main questions regarding the supper of the Lord.



Matt. xxvi. "'Jesus took bread.' Because He wished to leave to us not only a memorial but also a participation of His passion, and so of our redemption by His passion; for this 'He took' it, &c.; doubtless that both might take place under the appearances of bread and wine, as things which both might most aptly signify His body and blood, severed in His passion; and that the two were made *truly* food and drink; and that by it we might also be signified to be most closely joined to Christ and to be nourished to eternal life—to be welded among one another into one by the mutual bond of love, as one bread is made, and one wine, from many grains of wheat as well as of grapes flowing into one; as Paul shewed on this subject, &c. ... But He took unleavened bread, as well because leavened could not be present in that supper, as because unleavened most agrees with the meaning of sincerity and truth, which ought to be present in those that partake of these mysteries. 'And He blessed.' Heretics are wont to expound it, 'He gave praise,' 'He gave thanks,' namely to God: but it is certain that it refers to the bread; for the order of the words requires this and it is more open in the Greek, where it is said, 'He took the bread and having blessed He brake.' [The Greek hardly helps him, though he may be right in his assertion.] Therefore as to Luke and Paul saying 'having given thanks,' i.e. 'when He had given thanks,' they are not explaining the word 'He blessed;' for He also gave thanks to God for His benefits.... Mark viii. 6 simply says 'giving thanks He brake;' but Luke ix. 16 'He looked to heaven,' which is the custom of one

*Tetrateuchus seu Comm. in Evangelia.* Brussels, 1669.

Matt. xxvi. "Accepit Jesus panem." Quia passionis Sux, adeoque per passionem redemptionis nostræ, nobis non solum memoriale sed et participationem volebat relinquere, hinc "accepit," &c., nimirum ut sub speciebus panis et vini utrumque fieret, utpote quæ et aptissime significarent corpus et sanguinem *in passione separatum*, et utrumque esse factum *vere* cibum et potum; quo et Christo significaremur arctissime conjungi et ali in vitam æternam, inter nos charitatis mutux vinculo in unum confari, quemadmodum ex pluribus granis tum tritici tum uvarum in unum confluentibus, fit unus panis et unum vinum, prout hic indicavit Paulus, &c... Panem autem accepit azymum, tum quia fermentatus in illâ cœnâ adesse non poterat, tum quia azymus significandæ sinceritati et veritati, quæ participantibus de his mysteriis adesse debent, maxime congruat, &c. "Et benedixit." Hæretici exponere solent "laudes dixit" "gratias egit," nempe Deo; sed certum est referri ad panem; hoc enim verborum series postulat, et Græce apertius est ubi legitur λαβὼν τὸν ἄρτον καὶ εὐλογῆσας ἔκλασε... Quod ergo Lucas et Paulus dicunt, εὐχαριστήσας, i. e. "cum gratias egisset," non explicant verbum εὐλογῆσας, &c., nam et gratias egit Deo pro beneficiis... Marci viii. 6, simpliciter dicit "gratias agens, fregit." Lucæ vero ix. 16, "respexit ad cælum," qui est habitus gratias agentis, "et benedixit

giving thanks, 'and He blessed them,' *i.e.* the bread and the fishes ... He therefore blessed the bread here, *i.e.* He consecrated it or raised it to that point of dignity that He changed it into His body ... [ix. 16 has the accusative, *αἱ τοὺς*, whereas in the account of the eucharist there is none. Still I believe it to be implied.] This same blessing, as has appeared from Paul, He in like manner gave to the cup, when if it had been a common (benediction) the first would have been able to suffice, which would have been either given to the bread or to the whole supper at the beginning [a sound plea]. 'And He brake' the bread, now blessed and changed, into as many pieces as there were guests, and that after the manner of fathers of families ... But that He gave it *into the hands, not into the mouth*, is not a conjecture of little weight; both because He said 'Receive ye,' (a term) which is more customarily referred to the hands, and because that was the custom in the ancient church, that it should be delivered into the hands of the faithful, &c. V. 28, 'This is My blood.' For it is not meant either that the cup or that the wine is blood, as neither that the bread is body, but that His own blood was He, Whom it supplied, and to Whom His aim was directed. 'Of the new testament.' He alludes to Moses' words Exod. xxiv., where sanctioning the old testament by the sprinkling of the victim's blood, he says plainly in the same manner 'This is the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath 'made with you.' Thus therefore Christ opposes His own blood to the blood of calves, the apostles to the people of the Jews, sprinkling to sprinkling, a testament to a testament.... And these things rather looked to the fact that by the carnal observance of the law and the carnal good things laid up for its reward, the

---

"illis," scilicet panibus et piscibus... Benedixit ergo pani (hic) *i.e.* consecravit eum, seu eo dignitatis evexit ut *in corpus Suum* mutaverit... Hanc eandem benedictionem, ut ex Paulo patuit, similiter calici adhibuit, cum, si vulgaris fuisset, sufficere potuisset prima, quæ vel pani vel initio toti cœnæ adhibita fuerat. "Ac fregit." Panem, jam benedictum *atque mutatum*, in tot videlicet partes quot erant convivæ, idque more patrum familias... Dedit in manus, non in os, conjectura non levis est, tum quia dicit "accipite" quod ad manus usitatus referri solet, tum quia ista in veteri ecclesiâ consuetudo fuit, ut in manus fidelibus traderetur, &c. V. 28, "Hic est sanguis Meus." Non enim significatur vel calicem illum vel vinum esse sanguinem, sicut nec panem esse corpus, sed Illum, Quem præbebat, et in Quem intentio Ejus ferebat, esse sanguinem Suum [My edition has a note in ink at the side "Caute legendum"]... "Novi testamenti." Alludit ad verba Moysis Exod. xxiv. ubi, sanciens vetus testamentum aspersione sanguinis victimæ, eodem plane modo ait, "Hic est sanguis fœderis, "quod pepigit Dominus vobiscum." Opponit igitur sic Christus [Moysi], sanguinem Suum sanguini vitulorum, *apostolos* populo Judæorum, aspersionem aspersioni, testamentum testamentum ... Quæ tamen eo maxime spectabant ut per carnalem legis observationem bonaque carnalia

observance of the spiritual law and spiritual good things might be signified. 'Which is being shed.' And this although it can be understood also of the cross, because soon His blood was to be shed upon it; yet Luke and Paul clearly join it with the cup, as an adjective (in concord) with its substantive [Not in Paul. He says "This cup is the new covenant in My blood," and "blood" there at least *may* be taken to hang on the word covenant. Certainly there are not in Paul substantive and adjective: on Luke's case see Part I. of this work], 'which cup is being poured out' or made a libation [or tasted]. Whence Christ means that that blood was even then being poured out, *i.e.* offered to God, which is properly called to be a libation like the blood of a sacrifice. In this same sense Luke says of the body, 'which is being given for you,' and Paul, 'which is being broken for you,' *i.e.* is being offered and immolated. For bread is properly said to be broken: body is not. 'For the remission of sins.' Which is properly the effect of Christ as a sacrifice, not as a sacrament... But He joined remission more to the blood than to the body as well because in blood the method of the sacrifice is most clearly seen, as because blood is a more express figure of death... And from these arguments it is plain that the eucharist is not only a sacrament, but a propitiatory sacrifice (also)...[It is as well to refer also to the extracts from Beza. The chief argument however regarding Luke's expression is that "This cup which is being (*i.e.* in process of being) poured "out," cannot be taken otherwise than as a figurative speech: cup put for Christ's blood, because *the liquid* in the cup in Christ's hand was not going to be poured out, but drunk. Christ's blood alone was going to be poured out.] V. 29. He passes elegantly from the proper meaning of wine to the metaphorical: as is done also viii. 22 and John iv. 13, 14, to signify that He will be with them in the kingdom of the Heavens, &c., &c.

in præmium reposita significarentur observatio legis spiritualis et bona spiritualia... "Qui effunditur." Quod quanquam intelligi etiam posset de cruce, quia mox in eâ sanguis Ejus effundendus erat, Lucas tamen et Paulus clare conjungunt cum calice tanquam adjectivum cum suo substantivo, "qui calix effunditur," seu *libatur*. Unde significat Christus sanguinem illum *jam tum* effundi, *i.e.* offerri Deo, quod proprie libri dicitur tanquam sanguinem sacrificii. Hoc eodem sensu Lucas de corpore dicit "quod pro vobis datur," et Paulus "quod pro vobis frangitur," *i.e.* offertur et immolatur. *Proprie enim panis est frangi, non corporis...* "In remissionem peccatorum." Qui *proprie* est effectus Ejus ut *sacrificii non ut sacramenti...* Adjunxit autem eam sanguini magis quam corpori, tum quia in sanguine ratio sacrificii maxime cernitur, tum quia sanguis expressior est figura mortis... *Ex quibus patet eucharistiam non tantum esse sacramentum sed sacrificium propitiatorium. Et hoc ex his verbis convinci.* V. 29. Venuste transit a significatione vini propria ad metaphoricam; sicut fit etiam viii. 22, et Joan. iv. 13 et 14, ut significet Se in regno cælorum cum illis, &c. &c.

P. 333. "'They went out to the mount of Olives.' For it became Him to be taken not in the place of feasting but of prayer, as Origen says, John vi. 63, 'If then ye shall see the Son of man going up.' But there is an aposiopesis or reticence. 'What will you then say? will you be any longer scandalized with My words 'in which I said that I have come down from Heaven? &c.' V. 64. 'It is the Spirit that quickeneth,' &c. That their carnal intelligence as to the mode of eating is of no profit for life, but a spiritual: by which the flesh of Christ is to be eaten *in very deed* (but yet in a sacrament) not by faith alone, but not without faith and love... not as if He were speaking concerning a figurative metaphorical eating of (Christ's) flesh, or through faith alone as the heretics dream, but because He was speaking of an eating of true flesh, &c., &c." Augustine, Chrysostom and Cyril are claimed or supported.

---

P. 333.

Exierunt in montem Oliveti. Decebat enim non in loco convivii sed orationis Eum capi, ut Origenes... Joan. vi. 63, "Si ergo videritis 'Filiū hominis ascendentem.'" Est autem aposiopesis seu reticentia. "Quid tunc dicetis? An adhuc scandalizabimini verbis Meis quibus 'dixi Me cœlo descendisse? &c.'" V. 64, "Spiritus est, &c., caro non," &c. Carnalem intelligentiam eorum, de modo manducandi, nihil ad vitam prodesse, *sed spiritalem*; quā caro Christi *reipsā* quidem (sed tamen in sacramento) *non* solā fide sed non sine fide atque dilectione manducanda est... *Non* quasi de manducatione carnis figuratā metaphoricā vel per solam fidem loqueretur, ut hæretici somniant, sed quia de manducatione *veræ* carnis, &c. &c. He attributes this interpretation of his to Aug. and Chrysos. and Cyril.

(F.) GEORGE CALIXTUS (KALLISON). B. 1586. D. 1656.

He was the only child by the second wife of the pastor of Medelbye near Flensburg in Denmark, who born of a tradesman in Apenrade, in Schleswig on the Baltic, had been sent to Melanchthon to study for holy orders. This Calixtus was therefore by birth a Dane. Flacius the chief editor of the Magdeburg Centuries, which is a hortus siccus of short extracts from the fathers, in three great volumes, was constantly held up as an object of execration by the father to the son, as Melanchthon, and all he did and said, were presented to him to be admired and loved. The son had the great advantage of the thorough teaching of Latomus, who two years after the entrance of George took charge of the school at

Flensburg; and to him is the church of Christ chiefly indebted for whatever benefit she derived from the sound scholarship and free judgment of this great Lutheran divine. He therefore very naturally at the University of Helmstadt in Brunswick followed Melanchthon's writings in opposition to the very strict and stringent lines of the Formula Concordiæ, which the Prince Julius II. had imposed on the Lutherans of Brunswick. Melanchthon's party went by the name of Philippists, and into their disparaged company young Calixtus threw himself, and thus stood committed as the broad churchman of the national theology. Dowding reminds us that the Prince Henri Julius was brother-in-law to Anna, our James I.'s wife: he also quotes from Calixtus himself how the King of Denmark, when he received the Formula Concordiæ, at once threw it into the fire that was burning in his room. This act of uncompromising love of free thought was we may well suppose not lost on his subjects in general, nor on George Calixtus who recites it. He strove to widen his views by visits to the divines of other universities, including Jesuits; but such men as Pareus at Heidelberg and Casaubon whom he met in England were most valued and loved by him. To Paris he bore with him Casaubon's introduction to De Thou. From Italy he returned home to be made Professor at Helmstadt, where he married and settled himself; where also he buried his precocious prodigy of a son, who in less than seven years had so wound himself round his father's heart, that his future life was shadowed by his loss. In all his controversies and hard usage on all sides, the general lot of pacificators, he was solaced by his wife's sympathy, whom he survived but a short time, dying in 1656, little more than two years after her. In his closing illness, which began with fever, Cellarius attended upon him, and almost his last words in speaking of Christ were, "I know no other merit; Christ's death and merit is all my merit. I have forgiven all my enemies from my heart, and I pray God that He likewise may forgive them." Such was the greatest of Lutheran learned divines of that day, who yet received from his enemies the brand of "Theologus latro et latro theologus; The divine that was a robber, and though a robber was a divine." See the Life and Correspondence of George Calixtus by W. C. Dowding, Rector of Lytham, who rejoices in correcting his work by the aid of Professor Henke's newly published volume on "Calixtus and his Spirit."

*The Epitome of Theology. On the holy eucharist.*

P. 235. "Certainly among the Jews to break bread is the same as to take food. [P. 206.] Most of the ancients truly called it a sacrifice, partly in imitation of the Old Testament, because it may have seemed convenient to adapt its words and phrases to the rites of the New; partly that there is there present that which formerly has been the material of sacrifice, or the body and blood of Christ, which He offered to God the Father on the altar of the cross as a sacrifice for us; and partly because the eucharist, as a sacrament and act instituted by Christ, is a true worship of God, pleasant to God Himself and accepted by Him, and on that account is referred to the class of sacrifices that either are spiritual or are figuratively so termed; such as the mysteries of the New Testament are neither seldom nor ignobly named... [P. 207] from which arises the use of the other words host, victim, immolating, offering...[P. 208] For it cannot but be that faith is as it were nourished, augmented, and strengthened by frequently and seriously commemorating the Lord's death, on which it rests; first of all truly since such a commemoration of His death in this case takes place, that the very body itself is present, which was delivered unto death for us, and that blood itself, which was shed for us on the altar of the cross. But moreover both this body and that blood are not only present, but without any space intervening are inwardly and most closely joined to our bodies by eating and drinking. For the act of the holy supper is fulfilled when the true substantial body of Christ is received

*Epitome Theologiæ, p. 205. Brunsvigæ, 1603.*

Hebræis certe frangere panem idem est quod cibum sumere. P. 206. Sacrificium vero appellarunt e veteribus plerique, partim imitatione Vet. Testamenti, quod ejus vocabula et phrases Novi ritibus accommodare conveniens visum fuerit: partim quod ibi præsens sit id, quod olim materia fuerit sacrificii, sive corpus et sanguis Christi, quæ pro nobis sacrificium Deo Patri arâ crucis obtulit: partim quod eucharistia, utpote sacramentum et actio a Christo instituta, sit Dei cultus Ipsi gratus et acceptus; et propterea referatur inter sacrificia spiritualia sive figurate ita dicta; qualis mysteriorum Novi Testamenti appellatio nec infrequens sit nec ignobilis... P. 207. Et hinc reliqua vocabula hostiæ, victimæ, immolandi, offerendi... P. 208. Fieri enim non potest, quin fides crebrâ et seriâ mortis Domini, quâ ipsa nititur, commemoratione quasi nutriatur augeatur et roboretur: imprimis vero, quum talis hic Ejus mortis fiat commemoratio, in quâ præsens sit ipsum illud corpus, quod pro nobis in mortem traditum, ipseque ille sanguis qui pro nobis in arâ crucis effusus. Quin imo non tantum præsentia sunt et illud et iste, sed nobiscum indistanter intime atque arctissime esu potuque conjunguntur. Est enim sancta cœnæ actio, in quâ quando benedictus panis accipitur et comeditur, simul accipitur et comeditur verum sub-

and eaten, at the same time that the blessed bread is taken and eaten; and when the true substantial blood of Christ is received and drunk at the same time as the blessed cup is received and drunk, [more pronounced Lutheranism cannot be written nor can it be more adroitly stated,] that by the commemoration of His death there may be a confirming and sealing of His testamentary promise and of the faith which has embraced it. We say, in opposition to heresies both old and new, that in the holy supper together with the bread and wine are present and are taken the true body and blood of Christ, &c.

P. 210. "After the times of Charlemagne, when Lothair and Lewis the second were reigning, there lived one John Scotus, who is said to have denied the true presence of the body and blood of Christ in the eucharist, having put forth a book, which Lanfranc writes was condemned in the synod of Vercelli, held under Leo the ninth, about 170 years after the death of Scotus. [The history is briefly recited from Paschasius of the same age down to Guitmund, and Peter de Bruis, and Peter his opponent, of Cluniacum (near Maçon).]

P. 211. "From that time this mode of looking at this sacrament seems to have been put to rest: for neither can you easily find further patrons of it till you come indeed to the times of Wycliff, &c. At last when the darkness of the age of the Roman pontiffs was becoming lighter, and when the light of the Gospel at length arose, this error was called back from hell by Andrew Carlstadt, Hulderic Zwingel, Calvin and their disciples.

*stantiale corpus Christi. Et quando benedictus calix accipitur et bibitur, simul accipitur et bibitur verus substantialis sanguis Christi; ut commemoratione mortis Ejus promissio testamentaria et fides, eam amplexa, confirmetur et obsignetur. Dicimus in a. cœnâ una cum pane et vino adesse et sumi verum corpus et sanguinem Christi, contra hæreses cum antiquas tum novas, &c.*

P. 210.

Post tempore Caroli Magni, quum imperarent Lotharius et Ludovicus secundus, vixit quidam Johannes Scotus, qui veram corporis sanguinisque Christi in eucharistiâ præsentiam negasse dicitur, edito libello, quem in synodo Vercellensi, habitâ sub Leone IX., annis post obitum Scoti circiter 170, damnatum esse scribit Lanfrancus, &c. &c., regarding Bertram, Paschasius, Berengar, Adelman, Guitmund, Alger.

P. 211.

Ab eo tempore [*i.e.* of Peter de Bruis and his respondent the Cluniac Peter] videtur hæc opinio sopita fuisse: neque enim ejus patronos facile invenias usque quidem ad tempora Wiclefi, &c. Denique rarescentibus sæculi pontificii tenebris, et exortâ denuo evangelii luce, errorem Berengarii ab inferis revocarunt Andreas Carlostadius, Huldericus Zuinglius, Calvinus et horum discipuli.

P. 218. "I define a sacrifice in its proper sense to be an act by which a living being is, according to God's command, deprived of life in honour of God. Bellarmine in his book *On the Mass* defines it in the following manner: A sacrifice is an outward oblation made to God only, by which some being, endowed with senses and continued life, is, for the acknowledgment of man's infirmity, and for the confession of God's superior greatness, consecrated with a mystic rite by a lawful minister, and undergoes a change. It is requisite for a true sacrifice that that which is offered to God for a sacrifice clearly undergo destruction; *i.e.* be so changed as to cease to be what it previously was.

P. 221. Calixtus answers, "Whatever living being is sacrificed is destroyed by being slain. But the body of Christ, a living thing, is not in the eucharist destroyed by being slain. Therefore the body of Christ is not sacrificed in the eucharist, &c. [Carry this reasoning out and the peculiarities of Lutheranism perish as well as "pontifical" reasonings.]

P. 223. "We finally call your attention to the sending of the cup mentioned by Justin in his *Apology*, and by Irenæus, that water was freely used to lower the strength of the wine: but that it is a delusive inference of the pontiff's community that we are necessarily obliged to conform to this, De Lyra, on 1 Corinthians, c. ii., speaks on that subject thus, 'Water ought to be added, because it is probable that it was added by our Lord. For

P. 218.

*Sacrificium proprie acceptum definitio actionem quâ ex mandato Dei res animata in honorem Divinum vitâ privatur. Bellarminus, lib. i. de Missâ c. 2, in hunc modum definit, Sacrificium est oblatio externa facta soli Deo, quâ ad agnitionem humanæ infirmitatis et professionem Divinæ majestatis a legitimo ministro res aliqua sensibilis et permanens ritu mystico consecratur et transmutatur. Ad verum sacrificium requiritur ut id, quod offertur Deo in sacrificium, plane destruat, i.e. ita mutatur ut desinat esse id quod antea erat, &c.*

P. 221.

His syllogism in reply. Quæcunque res animata sacrificatur occisione destruitur, at Christi corpus, utique animatum, non destruitur occisione in eucharistiâ, ergo Christi corpus non sacrificatur in eucharistiâ, &c.

P. 223.

Postremo monemus de missione calicis cujus meminere antiqui, Justinus *Apolog.* 2, et Irenæus lib. 5, eam [aquam] ad temperandum vinum libere adhibitam fuisse. Sed pontificios ei necessitatem male affinxisse Lyranus in 1 Cor. c. ii., ita de hac re loquitur. Debet apponi aqua, quia probabile est quod Dominus apposuit. In terrâ enim illâ



'it is the custom in the Holy Land on account of the strength 'of the wine to drink it always mingled with water.'" [The doubtful word is *semper*, i.e. whether it was the custom at the passover. Buxtorf says nothing about it. The spirit of his very particular account leads you to think that the Jews did not dilute the wine at the passover. Some fathers expressly say it was pure wine that Christ gave.]

---

propter vini fortitudinem consuetum est semper bibere vinum cum aquâ.

(G.) JOSEPH MEDE, B.D., CHRIST'S COLLEGE. B. 1586. D. 1671.

The title-page of his works styles him "the pious and profoundly learned;" which no reader of his works will doubt. Yet it may appear to close students of all which the Scriptures assert on the Lord's supper that on this subject he was profoundly in error. And yet his judgment in general was singularly sober and sound. It may be taken as a proof of this that the Rev. Edward Elliott in his original and laborious work on the historical view of the Apocalypse, after having in several editions maintained that all Christ's true followers will partake of the first resurrection and of the millennial state, says expressly in a later edition that perhaps it is better after all to fall back on Mede's more limited view of a *reign of martyrs* (i.e. of selected persons of whom the apostles and perhaps David himself may be chief). This, whether it be the right view or no, on which it seems to be very hard to draw the balance, is at least a high tribute to the judgment of Mede. Those who have read Mr Elliott's work, instead of denouncing it without reading it, will be ready to think Mede would hardly have desired a higher honour. The wonder is that a portion of Mede's views on this sacrament remained what they were. He was reader of Greek in the university and tutor of his college till he died at 85.

The passages and extracts from Mede are a rich addition, containing many interesting ideas; but the idea rises up in the mind, Is not all this ingenious system very different from the idea of the sacrament which our Saviour left behind Him as one of His church's best treasures? Would St Paul, if raised to life and full of all good human feelings, recognise in this the system

that he received of the Lord? I fear me much he would dash forth at once into indignation and call it another gospel and an entirely new mode of forgiveness of sin, from that which the gospel presents. Mede must surely have departed from the gospel lines when he asserts that our blessed Lord at the institution did *offer* the elements *as a sacrifice* to the Father. It is said *Ex uno disce omnes*. If the prize were due to him who on ambiguous assumed hints from Scripture and repeated distinct assertions from the fathers, constitutes the richest and most imaginative sacramental system, it would I think be laid at Mede's feet, but if the crown is to be his who most nearly follows out the intimations in Scripture *only*, it will be far from being on the head of this very learned divine.

*Discourse 44, 1 Cor. x. 3. Fourth edition. London, 1677.*

"All ate the same spiritual meat, &c. The apostle affirms (the spiritual meat and drink) of the old fathers to have been *the same as ours*. The manna and the rock were spiritual, *i.e.* sacramental, and thus in this regard, they were signs signifying Christ, and pledges assuring the faithful receivers of them, enjoying Him with all His benefits: for a sacrament is not *a naked* or a single sign, but a sign assuring: *i.e.* a seal or pledge of the thing signified—a signifying pledge or an assuring sign... Plato in *Cratylus* says that the wisdom of the first imposers and inventers of the names of things was such in their choice that they made the letters and syllables to agree with and express the qualities of the things called by them, expressing soft things with soft sounds, harsh with harsh and so forth. So God in the sacraments, which are as visible words, has chosen such things as carry in them the character and very image of the things they are pledges of... Manna was given only in the wilderness: so is Christ our spiritual food in the eucharist so long as we travel in the wilderness of this world. But when we shall arrive in the holy Canaan we shall have no more need of sacraments; for then we shall have Christ present with us, &c. ... As a rock is the surest foundation, so is Christ. Whatsoever is built upon Him, no storms, no floods, no winds can shake or move... As the rock is said to have yielded water, but only to those who were there present... but followed them in all their stations in the wilderness unto the utmost ends thereof, so that water which gushed out from our smitten Saviour neither served nor stayed with those alone who were present at the time and place of His suffering, but ran and spread unto all places of the world where the sons of men had any abiding, and followeth them all the days of their pilgrimage in this wilderness even from

the day of His passion unto the present hour.... In what part of the earth soever thou art, in what time of the world soever thou livest, Christ our rock is ever with thee, and His water streameth after thee, which whosoever drinketh it shall be in him a well of water springing up unto everlasting life... Add. Who knoweth whether the cleaving of the rocks when He yielded up the ghost were not a sign of the accomplishment of the mystery? The invisible thing... double. First the root or fountain. Secondly the gracious blessings, &c. As God confers no manner of blessing upon us but through Christ, so the manner and metre of a sacrament is to confirm unto us whatever it assures only through Him. For all sacraments, both old and new, carry in them the marks of Christ... In the passover the favour and benefit that God would therein seal was, that He would spare and pass by the Israelites when He smote the Egyptians. And yet the sign ordained expressed nothing of passing by or sparing, but of Him only, in Whom and through Whom God passed by and spared them, viz. that immaculate Lamb, Whose blood where God beholds (in a figure) on the posts of their houses He will spare and not destroy them.

P. 253. "If the fathers ate the same spiritual meat, &c., which we do, then *we* eat not *the real body* nor drink the real blood of Christ. For the manna they ate was the same manna still, though a sacrament of Christ. The water of the rock was verily water still, though a sacrament of His blood. If then we eat *the same* spiritual bread, *we eat bread still*, though spiritual bread. If we drink the same spiritual drink our drink is wine still, though it is a spiritual wine. Yea St Paul himself calls them *as they are*, 1 Cor. x. 16 *The bread* which we break, &c. Ergo, That which is the communion of the body of Christ is bread still. And unless it should be so, how could there be a sacrament, which must consist of a sign and a thing signified [see how Maldonat takes off this common argument], of an earthly thing and of a heavenly thing. For if the sign once becomes the thing signified, it is no more a sign, and a sacrament is no more a sacrament... If it be urged that Christ says plainly of the bread, This is My body, &c. ... in my text *it is expressly* said, That rock was Christ... The manner of these speeches is nothing but a figure of certainty or assurance. He that receiveth the bread *as assuredly receiveth* Christ's body, as if the bread were His body, &c.

P. 254. "In that Christ became man yet He took not on Him the nature of every several man. Hence no man from His incarnation can apply these benefits to himself in special... Therefore the all-wise God Who knew our weakness hath so ordained in the mystery of this holy sacrament that it is a mystical incarnation of Christ to everyone who receives it. Hence Gregory Nazianzen

defines the eucharist *κοινωνία ἐνσαρκώσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ*, a communion of the incarnation of God. *He affirms* the bread to be His body and the wine to be His blood. By receiving this body and blood of Christ and so receiving *it* into the substance of our body and into our blood by way of nourishment, the body of Christ *becomes our body* and His blood is made our blood, and we become in a mystical manner flesh of His flesh and bone of His bone. And as in the conception of the holy virgin He took upon Him the nature of man that He might save man, so in His holy sacrament He takes upon Him the nature of every man in singular, that He might save every man who *becomes Him* in the Divine sacrament of His body and blood. His real incarnation was only in one; but His mystical incarnation is in many; and hence comes the sacrament to be an institution *whereby* Christ *is conveyed* to us: His benefits applied and so our faith confirmed.

P. 283. "This condemns that lurching sacrifice of the mass, where the bread and wine are offered as a sacrifice for the people, but they receive no one jot thereof, 2 Kings vii. 19 ... They think it is enough that the priest eats all himself, though he gives nobody else any with him. But it is no less absurd to affirm that another should receive good by the priest's receiving, than to hold one may be fed by the meat another man eats, or be saved by another man's faith. For a man is nourished by his own meat, and the just shall live by his own faith.

P. 255. "An eucharistical sacrifice or peace-offering was a sacrifice of fire, or expiatory, a part whereof was burnt upon the altar as in other sacrifices, but the remaining and greater part was eaten by the faithful people who brought it, that so their sacrifice, being turned into their body's nourishment, might be a sign of their incorporation into Christ to come, Who was the true sacrifice for sin. So whereas other sacrifices were only sacrifices, this was *also* a sacrament. The rest were only for expiation, but this *also for application*, being a *communion* of that sacrifice which was offered. Rightly was it therefore added to all other sacrifices; for what profit was there of expiation of sin, *unless it were applied*? Well might it then be called a sacrifice of peace. The Greeks call it sometimes *σωτήριον*, but commonly *εὐχαριστικόν*...with thanksgiving ...

*The Christian sacrifice*, p. 373. Mal. i. 11, "In every place "incense shall be offered unto My name and a pure offering." Chap. I. The text a prophecy of the Christian sacrifice according to the judgment of the ancient fathers in the second, third and fourth centuries. He quotes a rev. and learned prelate, "In the writings "of the ancient fathers there is frequent mention of the unbloody "sacrifice of the body of Christ in the eucharist." Chap. II. "The

Christian sacrifice meant the whole sacred action and solemn sacrifice of the church assembled ... The body and blood of Christ were not made of common bread and wine, but of bread and wine first sanctified... by invocation of the Holy Ghost made the symbols, &c. Chap. III. The Christian mincha. Is it not so called (a *pure* offering) in respect of that most perfect unblemished and invaluable sacrifice it represents? Chaps. IV. V. and VI. This Christian service is an *oblation*. Proved out of antiquity, properly προσφορά, but improperly θυσία. Ignatius to Sm. has both. If θυσία be synecdochically taken for an offering in general, as it is in the N.T., then the Christian sacrifice is θυσία ... The altar or holy table, the place of the public prayers of the church. [God in context—Christ.] Chaps. VII. and VIII. Sacrifices as federal feasts in which God and man feast together. So that in those (Jewish) sacrificial feasts as well as in the eucharist God is to be considered as the convivor and then as the conviva. 1st, Every sacrifice salted with salt. The salt of the covenant of God. What but the feast of the covenant? 2dly, The blood of the sacrifices the blood of the covenant. 3dly, Ps. I. Gather My saints unto Me, those that have made a covenant with Me by sacrifice. 4thly, Gen. xv. 9. Abraham's appointed sacrifices. God in the likeness, &c., made a covenant with Abraham. In which rite of passing between the parts God condescended to the manner of men... The Lord's supper a federal feast, the new covenant, *i.e. the rite* of the new covenant, &c.... There is nothing that remains to make this feast a full sacrifice, but that the viands therefore should be first *offered* to God, that He may be the convivor—we the convivæ, or guests. This proved from the testimonies of antiquity next to the apostles' times and from the ancient liturgies, also from the fathers, arguing on this oblation of the eucharist to God that the Father is the creator; and lastly from St Paul's parallel of the Lord's supper and the sacrifices of the Gentiles. (1) Our Saviour at the institution *did first offer the bread and wine to God* to agnize him the Lord of the creature. (2) Is not the celebration of the eucharist in the Western churches, whether the Reformed or the Roman, therefore defective because there is no oblation there in use? Christ is offered in the eucharist commemoratively only and not otherwise. The commemorative sacrifice or commemoration of the eucharistic words of S. Andrew, written by the presbyters of Achaia, Deo omni die sacrificio... immaculatum agnum quotidie in altari crucis sacrificio—cujus carnes, postquam omnis populus manducaverit, &c., agnus, qui sacrificatus est, integer perseverat et vivit."

(H.) ARCHBISHOP JOHN BRAMHALL. B. 1593. D. 1663.

An Englishman born at Pontefract. His life included an absence from England during the period of the Commonwealth. He was of Sidney College. In 1633 he went to Ireland, and it was at the Restoration that he became Primate of all Ireland. His diocese was then called Ardmagh. He is now adopted as an Anglo-Catholic, as it is called: but his opinions on the Lord's supper connect him not with any party, being so very nearly identical with the teaching of the Scriptures on that subject. Indeed though this archbishop did not, like Usher, finally attain to entire harmony with the simplicity of Scripture language in this most instructive and blessed of all the sacraments which God has ordained, Archbishop Bramhall is one of those few of whom it may be said that their teaching differs but little from Usher's and Barrow's and Tyndall's and Bullinger's and some fathers' such as Theodore and Macarius. If these stand decidedly at the head, it may be said of Bramhall and some five others, Proxime accesserunt. It will be observed that the writer of this book draws conclusions only from what he has read in the writings of the several authors. And it will he trusts not be forgotten that he is obliged to pass over many more favourable but less decisive passages, in the same authors.

*Answer to Miletieri* (then Bishop of Derry). Dublin, 1677.

P. 21. "That which weighs most with us is this that we dare not give Divine worship unto any creature, no: *not to the very humanity of Christ* in the abstract (much less to the host), but to the whole person of Christ, God and man by reason of the hypostatical union ... *Shew us such a union betwixt the Deity and the elements (or accidents)*. But you pretend to no such things. The highest that you dare go is this 'As they that adored Christ when He was upon earth did (after a certain kind of manner) adore His garments' (Bellarmine de Euch. c. 29, quodam modo), &c.

P. 35. "First you say we have renounced your sacrifice of the mass. If the sacrifice of the mass be the same with the sacrifice of the cross, we attribute more to it than yourselves. We place our whole hope of salvation in it. If you understand *another* propitiatory sacrifice, *distinct from that*, as this of the mass seems to be; for confessedly the priest is not the same, the altar is not the

same, the temple is not the same; if you think of any new meritorious satisfaction to God for the sins of the world, or of any supplement to the merits of Christ's passion, you must give me leave to renounce your sacrifice indeed, and to adhere to the words of the apostle 'By one offering He hath perfected for ever, &c.' Surely you cannot think that Christ did sacrifice Himself at His last supper. Then this subsequent sacrifice upon the cross had been superfluous—nor that the priest now *doth more than Christ did then*. We do readily acknowledge an eucharistical sacrifice of prayers and praises. We profess a commemoration of the sacrifice of the cross; and in the language of the holy church things communicated are represented as if they were acted, &c. We acknowledge a representation of the benefit of it. We maintain an application of its virtue. So here is a commemorative, impetrative and applicative sacrifice. [Bramhall up to this point so good and so acute fails, after Augustine's example, to see the great radical difference between a commemoration of a sacrifice and a commemorative sacrifice.] Speak distinctly, I cannot understand what you desire more. To make it a suppletory sacrifice—to supply the defects of the only true sacrifice of the cross, I hope both you and I abhor.

P. 21. "We rest in the words of Christ, This is My body... But whether it be corporally or spiritually (in a spiritual sense)—whether it be in the soul only or in the host also—whether by consubstantiation or transubstantiation—we determine not. [Methinks it was time he did.] *Modum nescimus. Præsentiam credimus.* [The kind of presence is the question. The Protestant faith is not simply negative but eminently positive.]

P. 16. "We find no debates or disputes concerning the presence of Christ's body in the sacrament for the first 400 years. [No? The fourth century saw more and more preposterous assertions made. Hardly one resisted.]

P. 22. "The fathers did not touch either the word or the matter of transubstantiation. Mark it well. Either name or thing."

[*Note.* It is well to try to settle the amount of force in this remark. In passages without number in the fourth century it is asserted that the elements are changed and become the body of Christ. Yet to all the senses they evidence themselves to be what they were before. Then what did men then believe? By degrees they advanced to the notion that the entire Lord Jesus was in the elements and on the table after consecration, and was received by themselves in receiving the elements. Some indeed

believed the Logos only came and dwelt in the elements; but for all the rest, they gravitated to the notion that the bread was still bread, &c., and yet that an entire Christ was in it or with it. In details they wavered, but this double belief prevailed. After a time men refined upon this idea, saying, Why need we believe that the essence or substance of bread is there? We do not see it. Very probably the only corporal essence that is there is the essence of Christ's body. Thus they held to a belief in the sensible properties (or appearances, *δόξας*) of the elements and an entire Christ too. In what did this differ from Transubstantiation? Only in the latter being more scientifically enunciated. I have not here quoted the fathers afresh. Their words are given in my extracts from them.]

(I.) BISHOP JOHN COSIN, OF DURHAM. B. 1594. D. 1672.

Born at Norwich, trained at Caius, Master of Peterhouse, and Dean of Peterborough, he was raised at the Restoration to preside in that northern diocese with its most splendid cathedral, half castle and half house of God. The idea is from Sir Walter. Certainly the reign of Puritanism produced or was followed by a strong reaction in many great divines of the seventeenth century, who may well be credited with having brought forward nearly all the arguments to be adduced on their side of the sacramental question; and all that they can adduce should receive full consideration. The Anglo-Catholic Library is said to exhibit the first collected edition of his works; but additions have been made.

*Notes on the Church Prayer.* On the Catechism.  
Ang.-Cath. Lib.

P. 154. "Bread and wine. If any other thing is brought for offerings by the people, it should not be consecrated for the sacrament, but blessed only, and given to the people to carry away. [P. 155.] Maldonatus says [translated], 'We call a sacrament, a sign which appears, but a thing signified, the body of Christ, which does not appear.' which approves of our doctrine and condemns that gross conceit of the ignorant Papists, that think they see and taste, &c. the very body of Christ corporeally, which every man abhors to conceive, even the best learned among the Papists as well as we. I cannot see where any real difference is betwixt us about the real presence. Maldonat, after a long examination



of the matter, concludes thus at last with us all...The body of Christ is taken by us sacramentally, spiritually *and really*, but not corporally; and so I have heard my Lord Overall preach it a hundred times [*i.e.* I suppose formerly Dean Overall, the writer of the part of the catechism that concerns the sacraments. In the first two, intelligent Papists and intelligent Church of England writers agree perfectly, because the term "sacramentally" means as a figure or sign; in the second the spiritually minded in all communions agree, such as Quesnel, Savonarola, Ken, Jeremy Taylor, Barrow, Isaac Ambrose, Owen, &c., &c. But in the third the Church of England is directly in antagonism to the Church of Rome, since she declares Christ's real natural body to be in Heaven, and not here, but the Church of Rome and several other Churches, and some that have not gone over to any of them, affirm that Christ's real natural body is received by the communicant when this sacrament is rightly performed.]

P. 336. "A true, real, proper and propitiatory sacrifice of Christ toties quoties, (as often as) this sacrament is celebrated, which is the Popish doctrine, and which cannot be done, *without killing Christ* so often again, and which we hold not, believing it to be a false and blasphemous doctrine, founding ourselves upon the apostle's doctrine that Christ was sacrificed but once, and that He dieth no more...The body and blood of Christ, which *are truly exhibited* in this sacrament, the one as well as the other.

P. 118. "Now the eucharist, though by way of eulogy it may be called a sacrifice in many of these ways, yet the real and true nature of it in the offertory is to acknowledge God's majesty and our misery, and *to appease His wrath towards us*, to get blessings from Him, and *to make Christ's bloody sacrifice effectual* to us. [There is no word of the Church of England, of which Cosin was a bishop, that teaches that God's wrath is appeased by the Lord's supper. I need hardly add there is no such word in the Bible; and this is one of the great dangers of calling it a sacrifice at all, because sacrifices were appeasing or propitiatory as regarding ceremonial offences. But further one may well object to saying that this sacrament "makes Christ's sacrifice effectual;" for even if anyone were to say that prayer and all means of grace do this, and that this sacrament only differs from them in that it does it in a higher manner peculiarly its own, objection may be taken to the phrase "altogether," because it *implies* that Christ's death cannot be effectual without the means; but it is in many cases without any means of grace, as to the thief on the cross and to multitudes since. The grace of God coming through Christ's death is effectual, independently of the means of grace. Their business is to bring men under the action of that grace: and this is the real ground of the danger that arises from calling sacraments effectual signs.

They are helpful, beneficial, subordinate workers, but it is God and God's grace that are effectual, for they, and not the means, produce the effect.] Formally and truly it may be called a sacrifice also in the very natural signification of a sacrifice *for aught I know any harm should come of it*. [The following words are added in brackets in a note in the margin], Not in strictness and rigour of speech; for *so* was there never any sacrifice, nor ever shall be any but Christ's alone.

P. 121. 'Spiritual food of the most precious body and blood.' Before consecration we called them God's 'creatures of bread and wine.' *Now we do so no more after consecration*; wherein we have the advantage of the Church of Rome, *who call them still creatures* in their very mass after consecration; and yet they will be upbraiding us for denying the real presence, whereas we believe better than they; for after consecration we think no more of the bread and wine, but have our thoughts taken up wholly with the body of Christ...And herein we follow the fathers, who after consecration would not suffer it to be called bread and wine any longer, but the body and blood of Christ. Iren. Aug. Ambrose, Justin, Prosper. [*Answer* (1) They are only called "these holy mysteries," which means these holy signs, and it has never been the custom to call Christ's body and blood signs. (2) I do not find a single instance in which the bread and wine are called Christ's body and blood, or any one in which we are said to receive Christ's body and blood. "Who have duly received these holy mysteries" is all that is said in the service after consecration. But (3) what could Bishop Cosin say to the following rubric? "If any of *the bread and wine* remain unconsecrated, &c., &c.: but *if any remain of that which was consecrated* it shall not, &c. but "the Priest, &c. shall reverently eat and drink the same." Let us turn this about. We see what the Reformers uttered, who put the substance of the rubric upon kneeling into an article, and therefore did not believe in the presence of Christ's natural body. Now what kind of a rubric about the disposal of the surplus bread and wine would they have written, had they believed in the natural presence of Christ's body and blood in, with, or under the forms of bread and wine? Could they then have put their hands to such a rubric as this: "If any bread and wine remain unconsecrated, &c., &c., but if any remain of that which was consecrated"? For *nothing* would remain of that which was consecrated, but at the most the accidents of it; *i.e.* if the bread and wine *had been changed* into Christ's body and blood, which most of the fathers, especially after Hilary, believed. Transubstantiation was intended as a kind of reform—a bringing of the general belief into a more apparent harmony with common sense; and in point of fact it had been long in a great degree anticipated. The qualities or properties of bread and wine were still there; yet men had to

believe that the body and blood of Christ were there too. So some believed in the presence of both entire. Some tried to drop one part of this double presence, some another, till a bolder mind said, Let us believe *only* the *accidents* or the *properties* of *bread and wine*, but we must hold the presence of Christ's Deity as well as the substance of the body and blood of the Lord; and in the course of ages the presence of Christ's soul was added, and the church adopted this belief, and thus escaped for ever from the idea of a complete double presence; *i.e.* of the elements and of Christ, both entire, which was the grosser and earlier form of belief.] 'Very members.' So Cyril [translated], 'We have taken the body of Christ to become of the same body with Christ, *συσσώμους*, and of the same blood among ourselves, *συναίμους*.' C. Jerus. c. 22, Mystagog. IV. c. 3, p. 320." [N.B. The Bishop has altered this passage. It is "of the same blood with Christ."]

(J.) EDMONDE ALBERTIN. B. 1599. D. 1652.

Pastor of the French church of the Parisians who met at the suburb of Charenton. His treatise on the eucharist in three books is replete both with historical facts and doctrinal truths. It is evident that Waterland greatly admired it, and it seems that it had great influence upon him, when he was preparing his own treatise. Nevertheless Albertin, as the extracts shew, had not wholly escaped from the general current. There are several points in which he diverges from the simple teaching of our Lord and St Paul. It is a parallel work to that of Hospinian of Zurich, equally rich in history, and equally painstaking in the discussion of doctrine. It is in three books. First, respecting the Scriptures relating to this sacrament. Secondly, on the successive opinions of the chief fathers to Isidore of Seville. And thirdly, a history of the steps by which the changes of practice and doctrine have been made to the time of Cyril Lucar.

P. 3. Preface. "But other writers I read accordingly as they may excel in any holiness whatever or doctrine; not that I think a thing true because they themselves felt it so, but be-

---

*Præf. p. 3, Daventræ, 1654.*

*Alios autem (except the Canonical Scripture) ita lego ut quantalibet sanctitate doctrinæque præpolleant, non ideo verum putem quia ipsi*

cause they have been able to persuade me either through those catholic authors or by proof through reason, of that which is not abhorrent to the truth.

P. 5. "The emperor Constantine in the very council at Nicæa had said, 'The books of the Gospels and of the apostles and the oracles (Divinely inspired sayings) of the ancient prophets instruct us what we must think on Divine subjects. Afterward we must lay aside hostile discord and take from their Divinely inspired words the solutions of questions.' 'I answer,' says Bellarmine, 'that this testimony is not to be made so much of, for Constantine was a great Emperor (general) not a great church-doctor.' And yet the Nicæan fathers assented to this, and as Athenagoras says, stoned heresy to death with the holy scriptures.

P. 2. Maldonat on Matt. xxvi. "That the ignorance of Calvinists and Lutherans is to be laughed at, since they, as if it were not enough for them, unless they were heretics in words, have refused to call Christ's body and blood the holy eucharist, as we do, but (must needs term it) the supper. [Did not Maldonat know that eucharist is not used in Holy Scripture for the supper?]

P. 903. Hebrews iii. "We shew as well from the Scriptures and right reason, as well from the Scriptures as from the fathers of the six first ages of the Christian era, that the bread and wine

ita senserunt, sed quia mihi, vel per auctores illos catholicos vel probabili ratione, quod a vero non abhorreat, persuadere potuerunt. Ep. xix. to Jerome, and c. Faust. 11, c. 5.

P. 5.

Constantinus imperator in ipso concilio Nicæno dixerat "Evangelici et apostolici libri et antiquorum prophetarum oracula plane instruunt nos quid de rebus Divinis sentiendum est. Proinde hostili positâ discordiâ ex verbis Divinitus inspiratis sumamus quæstionum explanationes." "Respondeo," ait Bellarminus, "non esse hoc testimonium tanti faciendum. Erat enim Constantius magnus Imperator, sed non magnus ecclesiæ doctor." Et tamen Nicæni patres huic assensi sunt, et Scripturis sanctis hæresim lapidaverunt, ut loquitur Athenagoras.

P. 2.

Quotes Maldonatus on Matt. xxvi. Ridiculam esse Calvinistorum et Lutheranorum *inscitiam*, qui, si satis non haberent si rebus nisi etiam verbis hæretici essent, noluerunt corpus et sanguinem Christi sanctam eucharistiam ut nos, sed cœnam appellare.

P. 903, Heb. III.

Ostendimus tum ex Scripturis et rectâ ratione tum ex Scripturis tum ex patribus sex priorum eræ Christianæ sæculorum panem et vinum

in the eucharist are not substantially changed through consecration, but only in their accidents by the addition of meaning and grace, nor are made the body and blood of the Lord in the proper (own) sense, but an image, a symbolical figure, a commemorative figure, a type, antitype [resemblance as in Gk. Test.], finally a sacrament and a sacred sign of the Lord's body and blood, or also of the absent Christ.

P. 989. "Jeremy Constantine, the patriarch, has no more than the same opinion, as Damascene also whose opinion he quotes...that everyone says he (Damascene) differs *toto cælo* from transubstantiation and the real presence...But that may again be collected equally from the very clear testimony of the more modern Greeks. For when Claud the Guisian cardinal had enquired from the Greeks at Venice among other things, what they thought on the eucharist, they answered, 'We believe and confess that bread is so changed into Christ's body, and wine in like manner into His blood, that neither the bread nor the accidents of the substance itself remain, but are changed into the Divine substance, &c. &c.;' but Cyril (qy. Lucar), the most recent of the fathers (said), 'We confess a true and sure presence of the Lord...that indeed which faith furnishes (or shews), not that which a fictitious transubstantiation rashly teaches.'"

How far the extract from p. 903 is borne out by the facts (which also was the basis of Jewel's challenge), perhaps the extracts I have printed from the first six centuries are sufficient

in eucharistiâ per consecrationem non mutari substantialiter sed accidentaliter, tantum per additionem significationis et gratiæ, nec fieri *proprie* Domini corpus et sanguinem, sed imaginem, figuram symbolicam, figuram commemorativam, typum, antitypum, ac denique sacramentum et sacrum signum dominici corporis et sanguinis sive etiam Christi absentis.

P. 989.

Hieremias Constantinus patriarcha... Illud tantummodo vult quemadmodum et Damascenus, cujus sententiam laudat...quod et a transubstantiatione et a reali præsentia *toto cælo* differre nemo est qui non videat. Sed id rursum colligere est ex aliorum pariter recentiorum Græcorum satis claro testimonio. Cum enim Claudius Card. Guisianus a Græcis apud Venetias inter alia quævisisset, quid de eucharistiâ sentirent, responderunt illi, "Credimus ac confitemur panem in corpus Christi et vinum simili ratione in sanguinem ita mutari, ut nec panis neque ipsius substantiæ accidentiæ maneat, sed in Divinam substantiam commutentur, &c. &c.;" verum novissimus patrum Cyrillus "Veram et certam præsentiam Domini confitemur...eam quidem quam fides exhibet et præstat, non illam quam fictitia temere edocet transubstantiatio."

to put it into the power of everyone to judge for himself, so that I need not say anything. I have given sufficient to indicate something regarding the folio of Albertin. I have drawn from him more liberally in the Third Part.

(K.) BISHOP EDWARD REYNOLDS. B. 1599. D. 1676.

As after rising to deserved eminence in the Church of England at Oxford, and becoming preacher at Lincoln's Inn, he joined the Presbyterian party during the struggles preceding the execution of Charles, it is not likely that his fame as a divine should not be greatly disparaged by many. Nor was being Bishop of Norwich at last likely to soften such feelings. The question is whether as a theologian he had not more of heaven in him than of earth. But in a more peaceful time there would have been a general reception of him as one of the Church of England's true saints and great teachers. He was born at Southampton, and went to Merton, of which college he was fellow.

*Meditations on the Lord's Supper. Works. London, 1677.*

P. 436. "These are all the holy actions that we find to have been by Christ and His apostles celebrated in the great mystery of that supper. All other human accessions and superstitions that are by the policy of Satan and that carnal affection which ever laboureth to reduce God's service to an outward and pompous gaudiness, foisted into the substance of so Divine a work, are all of them that straw and stubble which He, Who is a consuming fire, will at last utterly purge away. Impotent Christ was not, that He could not, nor malignant that He would not, appoint, nor provident, that He could not foresee the needfulness of such actions which are...obtruded...for matters substantial and necessary to be observed. As if God Who in the first Creation did cease from all His work, and in the second Creation of the world not finish the work Himself, but leave it imperfect, to be by another consummated and finished, &c. Away then with those actions of elevation, adoration, oblation, circumstation, mimical gesture, silent whisperings, &c. in which things as in sundry others they do nothing else but imitate the carnal ordinances of the Jews, the Ethnics, &c. &c. Certainly affectation of pomp, ceremony, &c. &c. unto the substance of Christ's sacraments are by Tertullian made the characteristics and presumptions of an idolatrous service. True indeed it is that the ancients make

mention, out of that fervour of love and piety towards those sacred mysteries, of adoration at them, and of carrying the remainders of them unto the absent Christians. But as in other things, so here. Things begun by devout men piously and continued with zeal, afterward degenerate into superstition—the form, purpose, end and reason of them being utterly neglected. It being the contrivance of Satan to raise his temple after the same form and of the same material whereof God's consisteth, &c. that he may the easier mislead unstable and wandering souls, and to retain at least a form of godliness that he may with less clamour and reluctancy withdraw the substance. That adoration which this did exhibit unto Christ Himself he impiously derives upon the creature, and makes it to be done unto the elements; &c. That carrying about and reserving of the eucharist, which the primitive Christians used for the benefit of those who either by sickness or by persecution were withheld from the meetings of the Christians, is by him now turned into an idolatrous circumgestion, that at the sight of the bread the people might direct unto it that worship which is due only to the Person whose passion it representeth;...for howsoever his power and tyranny may have done mischief to God's church, yet his masterpiece is the cunning and deceit which the Scripture so often taketh notice of.

P. 447. "But it is a spiritual presence of energy and power, and concomitancy with the element by which Christ doth appoint, that by and with these mysteries though not in and from them, *His sacred body should be conveyed to the faithful soul.* [Very unadvisable words to be put before what follows.] And such a presence of Christ, *in power though absent in flesh*, &c. Who can, without any necessity of a fleshly presence, send as great influence *from His sacred body* on the church as if He should descend visibly among us. [One marvels to see how the teaching of Cyril has penetrated. Christ and not Christ's flesh was the source of all His miraculous powers, and now forsooth we are to look for grace from His body, and divines like Reynolds are to teach this.] Whose sacred body (however it be not substantially coextended, in regard of ubiquity, with the Godhead), yet in regard of its cooperation, force, efficacy, unlimited by any place or subject—it having neither sphere of activity, nor stint of merit, nor bounds of efficacy, nor necessary subject of application, beyond which *the virtue of it* grows faint and ineffective, &c. [All this about the power of Christ's body to benefit us by a virtue inherent in it!]

P. 446. "Just so Christ is locally in Heaven, which must contain Him till the restitution of all things; yet having instituted these elements for the supply as it were of His absence,

He is counted present with them : inasmuch as they that receive *them* with that reverent and faithful affection as they would Christ Himself, do together with them *receive Him too, really and truly*, though not carnally and physically, but after a mystical and supernatural manner, &c. Presence, real being, a metaphysical term is not opposed to a mere local absence or distance [Thus is reproach brought on metaphysics], but is opposed to a false imaginary fantastic presence. [This is a change of the usual sense of the term real, that is all.] For if real presence may be understood of nothing but a carnal and local presence then that speech of Christ, Where two or three are met, &c. cannot have *any real truth* in it, because Christ is not locally in the midst of them. [The question is the meaning of the word "real" in reference not to the Divine presence of Christ, but to a presence of His body.] The presence then of Christ, which in the sacrament we acknowledge, is not any gross presence of circumscription, as if Christ Jesus in body lay hid under the accidents of bread and wine, as if He, Who was wont to use the senses for a witness and proof of His presence, did now hide from them, yea deceive them under the appearances of that which He is not.

P. 462. "Shall not any other of thy sins be put out by that blood which thy sins caused to run out of His sacred body? 3. It is a glorified body, and will not enter into an earthy and unclean soul.

P. 469. "As it is corporally in Heaven, so it will be spiritually and sacramentally in no place but a heavenly soul. Think not that thou hast received Christ, till thou hast effectually remembered, seriously meditated and been religiously affected and influenced with the love of His death. Without this thou mayest be guilty of His body: thou canst not be a partaker of it. Guilty thou art because thou didst reach out thy hand with a purpose *to receive Christ* into a polluted soul though He withdraw Himself from thee...As no man can see the sun except by the benefit of that light which the sun shineth on them, so no man can know Christ but those on whom Christ first shineth, and whom He vouchsafeth to know. Mary Magdalene could not say Rabboni to Christ, till Christ first had said Mary unto her.

P. 472. "In the building of Solomon's temple the stones were perfected, and hewed before they were brought. There was no axe nor hammer nor any tool of iron heard in the house while it was in building. And so should it be in the temple of which that was a type, even in the mystical body of Christ. Every man should be first hewed and fitted by repentance and other preparatory works before he should approach to incorporate himself into that spiritual and eternal building.



P. 472. "If the rain that falleth on the ground returns not empty, but according to the quality of the ground on which it falls makes it fruitful, either in herbs meet for them by whom it is dressed, or in thorns and briars that are near unto cursing, impossible it is that the blood of Christ in this sacrament should be ineffectual, whether for a blessing unto the faithful, or for a curse to those that unworthily receive it, &c. For this cause we find our Saviour Christ washing His disciples' feet, i.e. cleansing their earthly and human affections, before the institution of this sacrament. And we find Joseph of Arimathea wrapping His dead body in a clean linen garment and putting it into a new tomb never yet defiled with rottenness and corruption. And can we imagine that He, that endured not an unclean grave or shroud, will enter into a sinful and unprepared soul? The everlasting doors must be lifted up before the king of glory will enter in.

P. 482. "Doth the sweetness of those promises, like the fruit brought by the spies from Canaan, so affect me, that I am at a point, ready to encounter any Canaanite or sinful lust that shall oppose?"

There is a spiritual raciness about many of this excellent man's thoughts, which will ever keep them from dying out. It is not common. Would that in the terms he has used in discussion he had been more precise, and also in the ideas that he received on the supper of the Lord.

(L.) THE REV. WILLIAM CHILLINGWORTH, M.A. B. 1602. D. 1644.

When one has written the words, the author of "The religion of Protestants a safe way to salvation," one has said enough to place him on a level with Hooker; not so universal in the rhetorical riches and graces of style, but even superior to him in grasp of compact and invincible accuracy of thinking. The English language is honoured by being the vehicle of the thoughts that are compressed and elaborated in some of his paragraphs. Reading them is like Plato's vision, in the *Phædo*, of whirling on in the clear, pure air of truth: or if Plato's horses must come in, they are changed, and the whole reminds us more of *Æschylus*' picture of *Amphiaraus*, *Ὦς σάφρονα πάλοις μεταφέρων ἰθύνει!* We Cambridge men may almost envy Oxford its possession of him; or rather we may rejoice that she has such a name in her honoured rolls. His

course was singular. Born at Oxford, and scholar and fellow of Trinity, he joined the Roman Communion and studied at Douai among the Jesuits. But 1631 saw him home in England and a Protestant. He rose only to be Prebendary and Chancellor of Salisbury, which may be attributed to the terminating of his life within thirteen years of his return. It is something to have merited the title of "the best reasoner and most acute logician of his age;" for if the seventeenth century lost the simplicity of Bible doctrine, it was certainly illuminated by men of no common mental power. A sort of fluctuation seems to hold a kind of compensating vibration in the successions of religious thought.

*The Religion of Protestants a safe way to salvation.*

London, 1710.

"Know then, Sir, when I say, the religion of Protestants is in prudence to be preferred before yours, as on the one side I do not understand by your religion the doctrine of Bellarmine or Baronius, or any other private man amongst you, nor the doctrine of the Sorbon, or of the Jesuits, or of the Dominicans, or of any particular company among you, but that wherein you all agree or profess to agree—the doctrine of the Council of Trent—so accordingly on the other side, by the religion of Protestants, I do not understand the doctrine of Luther, or Calvin, or Melanchthon, or the confession of Augusta or Geneva, nor the catechism of Heidelberg, nor the articles of the Church of England; no, nor the harmony of Protestant confessions, but that wherein they all agree, and which they all subscribe with greater harmony as a perfect rule of their faith and actions, that is the Bible. The Bible, I say, the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants. Whatsoever else they believe beside it and the plain irrefragable and indisputable consequences of it, well may they hold as a matter of opinion. But as matter of faith and religion neither can they in coherence to their own grounds believe it themselves, nor require the belief of it of others without most high and most schismatical presumption. If for my part, after a long, and as I verily believe and hope impartial, search of the true way to eternal happiness, I do profess plainly that I do not find any rest for the sole of my foot but upon this rock only. I see plainly and with mine own eyes that there are popes against popes, councils against councils, some fathers against others, the same fathers against themselves, a consent of fathers of one age against a consent of fathers of another age, the church of one age against the church of another age. Traditive interpretations of Scripture are pretended, but there are few or none to be found. No tradition, but only of Scripture, can derive itself from the fountain, but may be plainly proved either

to have been brought in in such an age after Christ, or that in such an age it was not brought in. In a word there is no sufficient certainty but that of Scripture only for any considering man to build upon....Propose me anything out of this book...I will subscribe it...as knowing no demonstration can be stronger than this: God hath said so : therefore it is true."

Appendix, VII. p. 37. Argument against conclusions of the Church of Rome taken from the contradiction in doctrine of Transubstantiation. Close. Chillingworth replied that to say the extreme parts of a body are severed by the middle parts according to their entity, but *not according to place*, is ridiculous. His reasons are, First, because severing of things is nothing else but putting or keeping them in several places; and therefore to say they are severed but not according to place is as if you should say they are heated but not according to heat: they are cold but not according to cold. Indeed it is to say, They are severed but not severed.

(M.) DR JOHN LIGHTFOOT, MASTER OF CATHARINE HALL, CANON OF ELY. B. 1602. D. 1665.

By his high attainments in Talmudic theology he stands unrivalled. He is an instance of what a man can do by wholly giving himself to one line of things for many years. It is amusing to find that he was so devoted to this part of the literature of the Greek Testament that, though he was made a member of the Savoy Conference, he never found time to attend. His reputation casts a light on the Staffordshire Potteries, in the chief town of which (Stoke-upon-Trent) he was born, and near which he held a living. He became Master of Catharine Hall. He promoted the publication of the Polyglott Bible.

*On Baptism.* P. 266. "You see baptism inseparably connected, as an appendix, with circumcision. Certainly we acknowledge circumcision to be an ordinance of evidently Divine institution. And yet, which is worth noting, the Saviour rejected circumcision

*Horæ Hebraicæ. De Baptismo.*

*Vol. II. p. 266. Rotterdam, 1686.*

Appendicem vides baptismum circumcisione proselytarum inseparabiliter affixam. Circumcisionem certe institutionis plane Divinæ agnoscimus... Et tamen (quod notare dignum) Servator, rejectâ circum-

and retained its appendix, baptism. We may observe nearly the same thing concerning the eucharist. The lamb in the passover was of evidently Divine institution, and so indeed was the bread. But what was the authority for the wine? But yet Christ rejected the lamb and instituted the sacrament in bread and wine.

P. 912. On 1 Cor. xi. "I am far from denying that certain love-feasts were in use as appendices in the early ages to the supper of the Lord....But unless I am mistaken these banquetings of the Corinthians before the eucharist had a far different origin....As far as I know, there is none (of that age) that applies 'one is hungry' to the poor, and 'another is drunken' to the rich....But the Greek word for 'is drunken' applies well to the Jews in their previous feasting in keeping the passover before the Lord's supper; and 'is hungry' to the Gentile converts, enduring that waiting without eating, not so much from poverty or any necessity as because they would not recognize such a preparatory supper....If you choose to give the ignominious sense to the Greek word for 'is drunken,' it does not differ widely from that large drinking down of wine which they used to allow. The Jewish part of the church would by no means come to the eucharist without the preceding and paschal supper and banqueting, where elegantly and richly they were entertained and ate and...*ἐμέθυσον*, and carried it on to fulness and hilarity; when the Gentile part on the contrary, horrified at that Judaizing, and shrinking from such previous feasting, come yet hungering and fasting to the sacrament, *i.e.* not having supped. We believe that the Jewish part of this church, though converted

---

cisione, appendicem retinuit. Idem fere observare licet de eucharistiâ. Agnus in paschate Divinæ erat institutionis, et sic quidem panis. Ast unde vinum? At rejecto tamen agno, in pane et vino instituit Christus sacramentum.

P. 912. *De 1 Cor. XI.* (A curious exposition!)

Procul a nobis est negare usitatas fuisse Agapas quasdam, ut appendices cœnæ Domini sæculis ecclesiæ vetustioribus... Longe aliud respexerunt, ni fallor, conviviones istæ Corinthiorum ante eucharistiam... Non est, quod novimus, qui *ὁς μὲν πεινᾷ* ad pauperes applicet, et *ὁς δὲ μεθύει* ad divites... At *μεθύει* ad Judæos in *pro-cœniis* suis paschatizantes ante eucharistiam: et *πεινᾷ* ad Gentiles non ex paupertate aut necessitate mediam istam patientes tam quod cœnam talem præcedaneam nollent amplecti... Si sensum vocis *μεθύει* ignominiosum ei tribuere velis, non multum dissonat a largâ istâ ingurgitatione vini quæ tolerabatur... Judaica pars ecclesiæ nullo modo voluit ad eucharistiam accedere absque cœnâ et convivatione præcedaneâ ac paschativâ, ubi laute et affluenter excipiebantur et ederunt et...*ἐμέθυσον*, atque ad saturitatem et hilaritatem sunt provecti; cum Gentilitia pars e contra illam Judaizationem horrens, et procœnia talia refugiens, *πεινᾷ* adhuc et jejuna ad sacramentum accedit; hoc est, non cœnata. Credimus Judaicam partem hujus

to the Gospel, yet retained somewhat of the old leaven; and as in other things so also in this, Judaized or followed Jewish custom concerning the eucharist, gravely wandering from its proper aim and end, in thinking it merely an appendix to the passover. From their very cradles they had drunk in this instruction, that the Messiah when He shall come will not remove or change anything in the Mosaic ritual, but will move forward and carry up all to a more splendid form and pomp. V. 23. Why does the apostle need to recur to this? That they might observe that Christ had said, This is My body, &c., in order that He might teach them that the bread referred to some other thing than what was in the passover... That the scope and end of the communion of the death of Christ was not any paschal communion. For He had said of the wine 'which is the *new* testament in His own blood;' and what then had it (or He) to do with the passover? But now the wine is a representation of the blood of Christ, because the shedding of blood (*i.e.* under the law) was thenceforth about to cease; for the old covenant had been established in the blood of the paschal lamb in Egypt, &c. When the passover was being instituted the laws had not been promulgated. In like manner in the institution of baptism Christ establishes a *new* covenant. But when He had delivered the doctrine of the Gospel then He establishes the New Testament.

P. 914. "The new covenant (testament)...(1) This cup is not only a sign of the blood of Christ, nor only a seal, as a sacrament, but also the very sanction itself of the New Covenant, *i.e.* of the

---

ecclesiæ, quamvis ad evangelium conversam, aliquod tamen veteris fermenti sui retinuisse et, ut in aliis rebus, ita etiam in hac de eucharistiâ Judaizasse, de proprio ejus fine adeo graviter errantes ut eam appendicem tantum paschatis fuisse putarent, &c. Ab ipsis incunabulis hoc biberant, Messiam cum advenerit, nihil rituum Mosaicorum vel exterminaturum vel immutaturum, ast omnes in splendidiorem formam et pompam promoturum et evecturum...V. 23. Unde opus habet apostolus ut hic recurrat, &c.? Ut observarent dixisse Christum "Hoc est," &c., ut doceret panem alio respicere...quam in paschate... Scopum et finem communionem mortis Christi non aliquam Paschalem. Dixisse enim de vino "Quod est novum testamentum "in sanguine Suo;" et quid ei ergo cum paschate? At jam vinum est representatio sanguinis Christi, quia exinde cessatura erat effusio sanguinis (*i. e.* sub lege); nam sancitum erat vetus fœdus in sanguine agni paschalis in Ægypto, &c. Cum institueretur pascha, non promulgatæ fuerant leges. Pari modo in institutione baptismi novum sancit fœdus. At cum tradidisset doctrinam evangelii tum sancit N.T. &c.

P. 914.

Ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη... (1) Hoc poculum non solum est signum sanguinis Christi, nec solum sigillum ut sacramentum, sed et ipsissima sanctio N. T. *i. e.* totius evangelicæ administrationis... Ex inde cessatio

whole gospel administration. From that time the Jewish law ceased. (2) While therefore we receive this sacrament we profess and protest against all other dispensations and religions. (3) Therefore our communion in this sacrament is not so much spiritual as external and declarative of our common and joint holding of the Christian faith. Far be it from us to deny that it is a spiritual communion for the holy with God, and (mutually) among themselves in the use of the eucharist. Yea, rather we assert it to be of the most intimate kind between the true believers and God. And what, I ask, is that spiritual communion for the holy among themselves? It is mutual love, one heart, prayers for each other, &c. But they both can realize the same communion, and do realize it, when they meet for any other part whatever of Divine worship. Therefore their communion in this sacrament, which is distinctively named eucharistic [*i.e.* of thanksgiving], is that they assemble and by this outward sign openly and with united minds profess that they are united in one sacred tie, &c. (4) When therefore in any church we approach to the eucharist, we not only communicate with that assembly, with which we are at the time associated, but with the whole catholic church in the profession of the true Christian religion. V. 29. 'He that eateth, &c. unworthily 'shall be guilty, &c.' Of whom is he speaking? Of those that were relapsing and apostatizing from the gospel to Judaism, towards which these Corinthians were too much biassed. Guilty, &c. He who agrees that that blood was shed, and supports the opinion that His death was inflicted purely as a representation (like the old sacrifices) as these Corinthians did."

---

Judaismi. (2) Dum ergo sacramentum hoc recipimus, profiteamur et protestamur contra œconomias et religiones omnes alias. (3) Communio itaque nostra in hoc sacramento *non tam* est spiritualis quam externa et declarativa communis et conjunctæ nostræ professionis fidei Christianæ. Procul a nobis abest negare esse spirituales communionem sanctis cum Deo atque inter se in usu eucharistiæ; imo asserimus esse propinquissimam inter vere credentes et Deum. At quænam est ista spiritualis communio sanctorum inter se? Mutuus amor, cor unum, mutus preces, &c. At et eandem communionem exercere possunt, exercentque, cum conveniunt ad quamlibet aliam partem Divini cultus... Communio ergo eorum in hoc sacramento, quæ distincte communio eucharistica denominatur, est quod conveniunt atque externo hoc signo palam et junctis animis profitentur se uniri in sacro uno nodo, &c. (4) Cum igitur in aliquâ ecclesiâ accedimus ad eucharistiam, non solum cum isto cœtu communicamus, quocum tunc temporis consociamur, sed cum totâ ecclesiâ catholicâ in professione veræ religionis Christianæ. V. 29. ἀναξίως... ἐσθῶσι τοῦ σώματος, κ.τ.λ. De quibusnam est sermo? ... De relapsantibus atque apostatizantibus ab evangelio ad Judaismum, quo inclinarunt nimis hi Corinthii... Ἐσθῶσι, κ.τ.λ., qui sanguinis istius effusioni assentit et morti Ejus suffragatur, ut in nigram umbram infectæ, quod fecerunt isti.

(N.) DR RALPH CUDWORTH. B. 1617. D. 1688.

First Master of Clare and then of Christ's, and Prebendary of Gloucester. He was also Professor of Hebrew. He was a native of Somersetshire, and went to Emmanuel, which gave him his first honourable position as one of its fellows. Though the Intellectual System of the Universe is the work which will hand his name down to the latest ages, his sermon on the Lord's supper alone gives him the position of a fellow-labourer and rival to Lightfoot and follower of Buxtorf.

*Sermon concerning the true notion of the Lord's Supper.*

Volume II. London, 1743.

P. 8. "Having thus shewn that both amongst the Jews under the law, and the Gentiles in their Pagan worship (for Paganism is nothing but Judaism degenerated), it was ever a solemn rite to join feasting with sacrifice, and to eat of those things which had been offered up, the very concinnity and harmony of the thing itself leads me to conceive that that Christian feast under the Gospel, called the Lord's supper, is the very same thing and bears the same notion, in respect of the true Christian sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, that those did to the Jewish and Heathenish sacrifices; and so, is *epulum sacrificiale*, a sacrificial feast, I mean a feast upon a sacrifice, or *epulum ex oblatis*, a feast upon things offered up to God. Only this difference arising in the parallel, that because those legal sacrifices were but types and shadows of the true Christian sacrifice, *they* were often repeated and renewed, as well as the feasts which were made upon them; but now the true Christian sacrifice, being come and offered up once for all, never to be repeated, we have therefore *no more typical sacrifices* left among us, but only the feasts upon the true sacrifice, still symbolically continued and often repeated, in reference to the one great Sacrifice, which is always as present in God's sight, and efficacious as if it were but now offered up for us. [P. 9.] Besides those four general kinds of sacrifices...there were...these three: the firstlings of cattle, the tenth, and the passover. [P. 10.] There were three precise differences between the passover and the ordinary peace-offerings: (1) no laying on of hands upon the passover in the killing of it...as in all the peace-offerings; (2) no Mincah or meat-offering, and no libamen or drink-offering; (3) no waving of the breast and shoulder for the priest's portion...because the priests were bound always to have passover-offerings of their own. When I say the passover was brought to the taber-

nacle and offered by the priests, I do not mean that the priests were always bound to kill the passover; for I grant that the people were wont to kill their own passovers; and so I find it expressly in the Mishna of the Talmud. Massech Zebach c. v. s. 2. All Israel killed the passover and the priests received the blood, Exod. xii. 6, &c. [P. 11.] It is a great mistake in most of our learned writers to think that the killing of every sacrifice was proper to the priest. Lev. i. 4, 5; iii. 2. Maimonides. But Deut. xvi. 15 is I think wrongly explained of the temple, since it is *Jerusalem*: but he well adduces Numb. ix. 7 to prove that the passover was *korban*, an offering, and Exod. xxiii. 18, &c. &c. [P. 12.] The people of Israel might all kill the passover themselves if they pleased, because the killing of any sacrifice might be done lawfully by 'strangers.' [By this is meant other than the priest. He quotes Ben Maimon (Maimonides) on the Halachah Pesach of the Talmud, 'They kill, not the priest, but in the court.' N.B. From the Pentateuch it does not appear that the priest's killing a sacrifice instead of the offerer was legal. Cudworth speaks of the Talmudic order, which was nearer the old law than the practice in 2 Chronicles.] [P. 21.] Or I might take up the opinion of the Greeks, that Christ did not keep a true legal passover, but a feast of unleavened bread in imitation of it; or as the learned Hugh Grotius...expresseth it, not *πάσχα θύσιμον*, but *μνημονευτικόν*, such as the Jews at this day keep...but this opinion hath been exploded by most of our late authors. [P. 24.] Account of watching and proclaiming the new moon, and he thus explains the appearance of two passover-feasts in the Gospels at the time of Christ's arrest and death.

P. 27. "It is not a sacrificium but an epulum (a feast) *ἐκ τῆς θυσίας* (from the sacrifice): not a sacrifice but a feast upon a sacrifice; or else in other words not oblatio sacrificii, but as Tertullian excellently speaks, 'participatio sacrificii;' not the offering up of something to God upon an altar, but the eating of something which comes from God's altar, and is set upon our tables. Neither was it ever known among the Jews or heathens that the tables upon which they did eat their sacrifices should be called by the name of altars (1 Cor. xi.).

P. 26. "The eating and drinking of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's supper is, to be made partaker of His sacrifice offered up to God for us. Wherefore I conclude that the Lord's supper is the same among Christians in respect of the Christian sacrifice, that among the Jews the feasts upon the legal sacrifices were, and among the Gentiles the feasts upon the idol sacrifices; and therefore epulum sacrificiale is epulum ex oblati: *ὅπερ δεῖ δεῖξαι*. [There follows a shewing that eating together followed bargains, i.e. covenants of purchase and sale. I do not think



Dr Cudworth means that there is any true and real presence of Christ's flesh and blood, but only that it is a feast after and arising from the one sacrifice on the cross. My readers will judge.]

P. 34. "As the legal sacrifices with the feasts upon these sacrifices were *federal rites* between God and men, in like manner I say the Lord's supper under the Gospel ..must needs be *epulum federale*, a feast of amity and friendship between God and men; where by eating and drinking at God's table and of His meat we are taken into a sacred covenant and inviolable league of friendship with Him.

P. 14. The Jewish custom as it prevailed in the opinions of the writers of the Mishna near the end of the second century is thus given. "Nothing was killed before the morning sacrifice; and *after the evening sacrifice nothing but the passover*. The evening sacrifice was usually killed between the eighth and ninth hour, *i.e.* half after two in the afternoon, and offered between the ninth and tenth, *i.e.* half after three. But in the evening of the passover the daily sacrifice was killed an hour sooner; after that began the killing of the passover [refer to the Latin Thesis in the Appendix], which was to be done between the two evenings; whereof the first began at noon from the sun's declination toward the west: the second at sunset. [Surely they did not mean to say the text in Exodus meant this.] Yet the pascha might be killed before the daily sacrifice if there were any to stir the blood...till the blood of the daily sacrifice was sprinkled, for that always was sprinkled first. The passovers were always killed by three several companies. When the court was once full they shut the doors, and the priests stood still in their ranks with round vessels in their hands to receive the blood; those that were of gold in a rank by themselves, and those that were of silver; all without bottoms, lest they should be set somewhere on the ground and the blood congeal in them. And they killed the passovers, as the peace-offerings, in any part of the court, because they were *the less holy things*, as *the holy of holies* were always to be killed on the north side of the altar. The priests then took the blood and gave it from one to another till it came to him that stood next the altar, and he sprinkled it all at once to the bottom of the altar, &c. After the blood was sprinkled the lamb was flayed and cut up, the Imurim or inwards taken out and laid upon the altar. Then the owner took up the lamb with the skin off and carried it to his own home. The first company having ended, the second came in, and afterwards the third; and for every company they began anew the *Hallel* and sang all the while the passovers were killing: and when they had finished the *Hallel* they sung it over the second time; and when they had gone over it a second time they began

it a third time, although it was never known that the third time they sang out the Hallel quite, or came any further than the 'I love the Lord,' Ps. cxvi., before the priests had done.

P. 11. "Isaac Abrabanel will teach us more particularly in his comment on Leviticus that there were five things to be done by *the owners of the sacrifice* that brought it, and five things by the priest that offered it. The first five were laying on of hands, killing, flaying, cutting up and washing of the inwards; the other five were the receiving of the blood in a vessel, the sprinkling of it upon the altar, the putting of fire upon the altar, the ordering of the wood upon the fire, and the ordering of the pieces on the wood.

P. 18. "The Latin church ever maintained the contrary opinion against the Greeks, *viz.* that the Jews kept the Passover on the same night that our Saviour did...Paulus Burgensis, Scaliger, Casaubon [held with the Greeks]. Mr Broughton and Johannes Cloppenbergh [with the Romans]. J. C. says the paschal lamb could not be killed outside the temple of Jerusalem. In the temple it could not be killed against the general consent of the people. Wherefore *neither could the day of killing it be anticipated*....It must therefore either be said that Christ ate a lamb which had not been slain in the temple and so violated the law (God forbid), or that the Jews celebrated the Passover at the same time as Christ."

The last sentence of J. C. includes a parenthesis as follows: "For according to the law the lamb was to be carried down out of the temple into their private houses, to be eaten at home, after the fat had been consumed by fire in the temple, and the blood taken down (*delatum*) to the altar." I notice this the more, because Dr Cudworth appears to me to have erred in interpreting Deut. xii. 4, "the place which the Lord shall choose out of all the tribes of Israel to place His name there, &c." of the *temple* of Jerusalem: for since it is added "there shall ye eat before the Lord," and as this word of J. C. reminds us, they did *not* eat in the temple courts, "the place chosen" for them to bring their sacrifices and eat must be not the holy temple but *the holy city* Jerusalem. See v. 18, xiv. 23, 26, and others, particularly xvi. 5, Thou shalt not be able to sacrifice the passover in *any* of thy gates [except Jerusalem], *lit.* in one of thy gates. But at the place which the Lord thy God shall choose, &c. thou shalt sacrifice the passover at evening, about the *entering* of the sun (into the sea or horizon, Montanus), (*Exodus*, between the two evenings, *i.e.*

at twilight,) and at the time appointed for thy going out of Egypt; and thou shalt cook and eat it in the place which the Lord thy God shall have chosen, &c. *i.e.* in the houses or lodgings in the holy city, certainly not in the sacred bounds of the temple. I marvel that this escaped such an eye as Dr Cudworth's.

(O.) DR HENRY HAMMOND. B. 1605. D. 1660.

Born at Chertsey. Went from Eton to Magdalen, Oxford: became Fellow, and afterwards Canon of Christchurch, and Subdean, and Public Orator. Previously Rector of Penshurst, and Archdeacon of Chichester. By his mother's side he was descended from the author of Nowell's Catechism; and his father was physician to Prince Henry. Hammond assisted Sir H. Saville in editing Chrysostom. The living of Penshurst was given him by the Earl of Leicester in gratitude for a single sermon. It is related of him that he brought the use of the Lord's supper to "an imitation of primitive frequency," having it regularly once a month. The midnight oil which he burned, after a time produced close acquaintance with medical doctors; and he pathetically but simply regrets that their injunctions deprived him of his choicest hours. He grappled with the whole compass of theological learning as then understood, but scantily, as was the custom, pressing the full sense out of the Greek Testament, and giving great comparative weight to the fathers, under the idea still prevailing with many that the received fathers agreed more than they do, and that when they agreed they constituted a sufficient standard of right and truth. He had a notable dream well related by his biographer, Bishop Fell.

His mind appears to have been elegant and well-furnished rather than of a powerful grasp, as he had some Hebrew and Oriental learning, but not on the broad scale of Lightfoot and Cudworth, and some others whose names occur to everyone. We can hardly be wrong in reckoning him as a person of singular amiability, which probably increased people's willingness to concede to him the palm of unusual learning. His last words were "Lord make haste," which he repeated three or four times, his internal complaint causing him great pain. His contribution to

the literature of the Lord's supper is interesting. His career was peaceful in a time of trouble, though a price of £100 was once set on his head, as a devoted servant of King Charles.

*Practical Catechism.* Lib. VI. Sec. 4. Vol. I. London, 1684.

P. 123. "C. If you will take my judgment, this must be the method, which will cost you some attendance ; First, to survey the story of Christ's institution of this sacrament in the Gospel, &c. &c.

P. 125. "A commemoration of the death of Christ, *a representing the passion to God* (?) and a coming before Him in His name, (1) to offer our sacrifices of praises and supplications, &c., and secondly to commemorate that His daily continual *sacrifice* in intercession for us, at the right hand of His Father, now in Heaven. [Note. I find in Holy Scripture no warrant for this and one former idea of Dr Hammond regarding the sacrament.]

P. 126. "The Jewish phrases, customs...The lamb....was wont to be called *The body of the passover* or the body of the paschal lamb. Christ seems to allude to this phrase when He says, This is My body. Talmud de Pasch. and Maimonides... It seems to be answerable to and substituted for *This is the bread of affliction* which our fathers ate in Egypt or, This is the unleavened bread, &c. &c. This is the passover. [And he quotes the famous passage of Theodoret, Dial. 2, with *μεταβιβάζεται καὶ ἕτερα γίνεται*, and he alludes to the many compounds with *μετά* in the Bishop of Norwich's *Θεάνθρωπος*. He well translates *κατ' οἶκον* in some house or room: but he applies, like many other, "breaking bread" to the Lord's supper. [Note the use the Rhemish commentators make of this in the argument on this erroneous notion in the extracts under Fulke.]

P. 127. "Do this, do all that I have done in your presence, &c.

P. 129. "The cup of blessing, Syriac, The cup of praise... the benefits purchased *by it*, viz. The washing away of sins (?).

P. 130. "God's free pardon and remission, *His* speaking peace to the unquiet, *His* saying, Thy sins are forgiven to the burdened and sin-sick soul is the greatest only refreshment to that soul. *Let God say the word only* and Thy servant shall be healed. And this pardon was wrought by the blood, i.e. *again* by the death of Christ, by the sacrifice and satisfaction of that innocent Saviour, by which suffering we are released, by Whose stripes we are healed." [Everyone must recognize Dr Hammond's true piety. The italics whether of doubt or approval are mine.]

## (P.) SUPERINTENDENT ECKHART. 1621.

The date will prevent his being for a moment confounded with the grand and yet freethinking and pantheistic teacher of Tauler.

*Bundle of Religious Controversies.*

P. 491. "That John vi. does not treat of the sacramental eating... I. It was always profitable to produce salvation, v. 51: the eating of the eucharist with many does not profit to salvation, as Paul testifies. Therefore the eucharistic eating is not (the blessing) described in John vi. II. The eating in J. vi. is necessary always and absolutely for all, v. 53. (Mere) sacramental eating is not thus absolutely necessary for all. Therefore the eating, J. vi., is not the sacramental. III. The eating in J. vi. belongs to all times. The sacramental eating does not belong to all times. Therefore the eating in J. vi. is not the sacramental. Also the eating, J. vi., ought to be continual. The sacramental eating is not continual, but has its own intervals. Therefore the eating, J. vi., is not the sacramental. IV. The eating in J. vi. is the eating by faith. The sacramental is not, as far as it is merely such, an eating by faith. Therefore the eating in J. vi. is not sacramental. Assumption: That the eating by faith is spiritual, perpetual, and having place even externally to the sacrament, when even some Calvinists distinguish it from the sacramental eating. v. The bread which is matter of the eating described, J. vi., is bread spoken of metaphorically. The bread which is the

---

*Eckharti Fasciculus. Schwartzburgensis.* Leipsic, 1621, 2, 3, p. 491.

Quod Johannes vi. non agat de manducatione sacramentali. (I.) Manducatio corporis Christi semper profuit ad salutem, v. 51; manducatio eucharistiæ multis non proficit ad salutem teste Paulo. Ergo manducatio eucharistica non est descripta, Joh. vi. (II.) Manducatio, J. vi., semper et omnibus absolute necessaria, v. 53. Manducatio sacramentalis non ita omnibus est absolute necessaria. Ergo mand. J. vi., non est sacramentalis...(III.) Mand. J. vi. est omnium temporum. Mand. sac. non est omnium temporum. Ergo Mand. J. vi., non est sacramentalis. Item Mand. J. vi., debet esse continua. Mand. sac. non est continua sed sua habet intervalla. Ergo mand. J. vi., non est sacramentalis. (IV.) Mand. J. vi., est mand. fidei. Sac. mand. (quâ talis) non est mand. fidei. Ergo mand. J. vi., non est sacramentalis. Assumptio. Quia manducatio fidei est spiritualis, semper et extra sacramentum etiam locum habens, quum Calviniani etiam nonnulli a sacramentali distinguunt. (V.) Panis, qui est materia mand. J. vi. descriptæ, est panis metaphorice dictus. Panis qui est

matter of the eating in the sacrament is not bread metaphorically, but properly (so) called. Therefore the eating is not the same in the latter as in the former.

Q. v. "Whether the word 'eat' in the words of the institution can be taken figuratively of the eating which takes place by faith... Argument I. To eat by faith alone is the act of believers. To eat of the eucharist is the act of them that do not believe too. Therefore to eat by (or of) faith is not the same as the eucharistic or sacramental eating. [He then raises] Q. VI. Whether the instrument by which Christ's body and blood are received in the supper be faith or the bodily mouth. [And he concludes consistently with his line of reasoning that it is the latter. He thus in his mode of arguing separates himself from the chief Reformers.] Q. VII. Whether this be the true sacramental eating which has only to do with external symbols. His conclusion consistently is that it is not. But Q. XIII. is, Whether the word 'is' in the words of the institution can support the assertion of a trope, and can be metaphorically taken for 'signifies,' and Q. XIV. is, Whether in the proposition which Christ utters 'This 'is My body,' 'the body' be by metonymy the same as 'the sign 'of the body.' Both he pronounces impossible, and Q. XVI. is, Whether a trope can be understood to run through the whole proposition regarding the sacrament." This also he denies, and in Q. XVII. says that "the bread is Christ's body" is not metaphorical. Christ's words are treated throughout as logical, and not as popular language.

---

*materia mand. in sac. non est panis metaphorice sed proprie dictus. Ergo non est eadem hic quæ illic manducatio.* This discussion is preceded by extracts from Zwingel, Beza, P. Martyr, Walter and Trelcat.

Q. V. An vocabulum "edere" (*i. e. λαβete φάγετε*) in verbis institutionis metaphorice possit accipi, de comestione quæ fit per fidem. Zwingel's "edere est credere," "to eat is to believe," is quoted, and Musculus, and Beza, and Westphal, and P. Martyr, and then Eckhart writes *Refutantur*, and gives arguments that *edere* refers to the bread: *e. g.* A. III. *Edere fidei tantum fit a credentibus. Edere eucharistiæ* [should be acc. with *per*. So "fidei"] *etiam e non credentibus. Ergo edere fidei non est edere eucharisticum seu sacramentale.* Q. VI. An instrumentum, quo corpus et sanguis Christi in cœnâ percipiuntur sit fides an os corporis: His Q. VII. is an hæc sit "vera" manducatio sacramentalis quæ tantum in externis symbolis occupatur. Q. XIII. An copula "est" in verbis institutionis possit sustinere tropum et metaphorice accipi pro "significat"? Q. XIV. An in propositione illâ Christi "Hoc est corpus Meum" corpus per metonymiam idem sit quod signum corporis. Q. XVI. An tropus esse possit in totâ propositione sacramentali.

So in Q. XXIII. he is obliged to affirm that the "true" body and blood of Christ are not made void, non evacuantur, by the unworthiness and want of faith of the receivers, a conclusion which revolts many of the superior Roman reasoners as well as Protestants. For to believe that the very natural body and blood of Christ can be in an unbeliever's body, and that with these in him he can perish, does seem most strange; and fourth-century views and reasonings greatly increase its incredibility.

And yet to admit the only alternative, *viz.* that in a row of communicants the bread is Christ's very natural body to some, say to numbers 1, 3, 6, 10, and is changed back into mere bread while it is being given to 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, is equally strange and incredible.

Therefore the only supposition at all credible is that the words of institution involve in themselves a metaphor, and (1) that the bread and wine remained both in their sensible properties and in their substance, and (2) that the very natural body of Christ with all that pertains to it is in Heaven and not here.

His Q. XXIV. is *An corpus et sanguis Christi "substantia-liter" in sacrosanctæ cœnæ usu manducantibus atque bibentibus exhibeantur*, Whether Christ's body and blood be substantially supplied in the use of the sacred supper to them that eat and drink. The marks " " are mine, to shew that he uses "vere" *truly*, and "substantialiter" *substantially*, as equivalent terms. He has three more questions, about "water" for "wine," about infants, and about the sick.

(Q.) ANTOINE ARNAULD, DOCTEUR DE LA MAISON ET SOCIÉTÉ DE SORBONNE. B. 1612. D. 1694.

In the absence of any works of M. de St Cyran, the last and best director of Port Royal, it may suffice to call up in addition to M. Jansenius (his fellow-student) "the great Arnauld" who like the rest of the Arnauld family had sought direction at M. de St Cyran's hands. This fact is shewn by about three letters on both sides which are to be found almost at the beginning of the 1108 letters of this youngest son of that wonderful family, which are preserved to us in the first three of his 42 quarto volumes. Five more quartos constitute a separate work "On the perpetuity of

"the faith according to the fathers regarding the Lord's supper." In this extremely valuable mass of writing—containing a very continent of theological discussion—the first treatise most to our purpose is the reply to a treatise by M. La Noue a Jesuit who wrote to make communicating in that rite very easy, even to those that were living in habitual sin, on the ground that they will get benefit from observing the rite; and M. Arnauld urges the duty of delaying absolution in all doubtful and bad cases till the truth of the professed repentance of the sinners has been proved by at least a few days' experience: and letter 741, to M. Du Vaucel, contains a declaration on this subject, that is not without interest even to English Protestants of the present day.

Nov. 11, 1689. "I have not pretended that the great men of whom I spoke to you have never made use of delay before granting absolution (*i.e.* in order to admit the persons in question to the Communion); but it is certain that they very seldom made use of it, and, that they ordinarily were contented themselves with the promises that such persons made to them, after frequent relapses into sin, without requiring them to give proofs of their sincerity by a real change of life. Emeric de Bonis, an ancient Jesuit, has well proved the excellent effects of such delay. S. Charles [of Borromeo] also has laid down very excellent rules for it. But he might easily take care that those who worked under him should not press the matter too hard. But now we ought to give God thanks that this salutary practice has been more commonly adopted since the publication of that book on Frequent Communion."

Then follow details respecting India, and the life of St Bertrand, on the same subject. The other treatise specially belonging to our subject occupies five volumes. It is a reply to the Calvinist pastor of Charenton, M. Claude. Both these treatises are written after the manner of our Bishop Jewel's reply to Mr Harding, citing successive passages from the works of the opponents and replying to them. The ground occupied by M. Claude is enlarged in Vol. II. by introducing the views of other Protestants in a somewhat irregular manner. An instance of this I beg to adduce from Vol. II. Book I. c. 7.

"The Calvinists have afterwards been heard advancing many other astonishing wonders concerning this ceremony and the bread, that it is a sacrament and a seal of the promises; an efficacious figure; that men receive in it supernatural and miraculous results; that the Holy Spirit acts powerfully in it for the soul; that the



flesh of Jesus Christ in it communicates its life; that He truly nourishes us in it by the substance of His flesh; that it is truly and substantially present, though only by faith; that He gives us His flesh to eat in an incomprehensible and ineffable manner; real and spiritual together."

Now M. Arnauld might well apply to this a word he uses in the title of the former chapter, *viz.* un mélange, for he gives no references to any one author; and to make a party responsible at once for all the mutually inconsistent things that separate members of that party hold or say, may do to raise a prejudice or a laugh; but it holds not at all as argument. For instance, can a man protest against anything more strongly than I have done in this book against most of these propositions? and yet, as I am not a Lutheran nor a Remonstrant nor a Socinian, he would class me, though incorrectly enough, under his general term for the rest, *i.e.* Calvinists. But I hold Calvin's opinion on the Lord's supper to be only less inconsistent with our Lord's and Paul's revelations than those of Luther or M. Arnauld.

P. 74. *On frequent Communion.* "On frequency of communicating, to serve as a reply to a paper entitled, The question whether it is better to communicate frequently or seldom (Preface, Vol. xxvii.). As she, a person of high condition, was persuaded that there is no true way to go to Heaven than that which Jesus Christ has traced out for us by His words and by His example, she was touched to see that the drift of the author of this paper was no other than to turn men's souls from the narrow way of the gospel, that under the pretext of representing to them the usefulness of frequent communion he was ruining all the dispositions of the mind that were needful for it, without which that holy food is turned to poison, according to the saying of the fathers that, not satisfied with the indiscretion of bringing all sorts of persons

*De la frequente Communion, pour servir de reponse à un écrit intitulé "Question s'il est meilleur de communier souvent, que rarement."*

*Vol. XXVII. Preface, p. 74.*

Comme elle estoit très persuadée (*i.e.* une personne de grande condition) qu'il n'y a point de chemin plus véritable pour aller au ciel, que celui que Jesus Christ nous a tracé par Ses paroles et par Son exemple, elle fut touchée de voir que l'auteur de cet écrit ne tendoit qu'à détourner les âmes de la voie étroite de l'évangile, que sous prétexte de représenter l'utilité de la frequente communion, il en ruinoit toutes les dispositions nécessaires, sans lesquelles cette viande sainte se tourne en poison, selon les peres; que non content de porter indiscretement

to partake very frequently of these terrible mysteries, he judged to be even well disposed for intimate communication with the Son of God in the eucharist, those that are filled with self-love, and so attached to the world that it is marvellous; and at last that it visibly appeared that he had taken upon him to check the spirit of penitence, to abolish the most holy exercises for that end as contrary to church-usage, to decry the practice of it as rash and proceeding from the spirit of error: to cause the direction, that brings sinners to it, to pass for pernicious direction and a stratagem of the devil.

P. 181. "First part: which treats of the true understanding of the passages of the Scripture and the fathers which this author alleges on behalf of frequency of communicating: of the conditions of a good director for regulating communions: if one ought to bring indifferently all sorts of persons to communicate during all the eight days; and of the unfitness which venial sins may put into the way of frequently communicating. Chap. 1. The rule one ought to follow in all things, the sentiments of antiquity, the traditions of holy men and the old customs of the church.

P. 303. "Second part: which treats of this question whether it is better and more useful to the souls that feel themselves guilty of mortal sins to communicate as soon as they have confessed, or

toutes sortes de personnes à participer très souvent à ces mysteres terribles, il jugeoit même bien disposés à une communication très particuliere avec le Fils de Dieu dans l'eucharistie "ceux qui sont remplis de l'amour d'eux-mêmes et si attachés au monde que de mer-veilles;" et enfin qu'il paroïssoit visiblement, qu'il avoit entrepris de s'opposer à l'esprit de penitence; d'en abolir les plus saints exercices comme contraire à l'usage de l'église; d'en decrier la pratique comme temeraire et procedante de l'esprit d'erreur; de faire passer la conduite qui y porte les pecheurs pour une conduite pernicieuse et un stratagème du diable.

P. 181.

Premiere partie: Ou il est traité de la veritable intelligence des passages de l'Ecriture et des peres que cet auteur allegue pour la frequente communion: des conditions d'un bon directeur pour regler les communions: si l'on doit porter indifféremment toutes sortes de personnes à communier tous les huit jours; et de l'indisposition que les péchés véniels peuvent apporter à la frequente communion. Chap. 1<sup>er</sup>. La regle, qu'on doit suivre en toutes choses, les sentiments d'antiquité, les traditions des saints, et les vieilles coutumes de l'église.

P. 303.

Seconde partie: ou est traite cette question, s'il est meilleur et plus utile aux ames qui se sentent coupables des péchés mortels, de communier aussitôt qu'elles se sont confessées; ou de prendre quelque tems pour se

to take some time to purify themselves by exercises of penitence before they present themselves at the holy altar. [We should push the requirement further, whether they have come to hate sin by love to Christ and their own renewal unto life.]

P. 492. "S. Charles (Borromeo). How criminal before God is the neglect of those confessors that persuade themselves that the only thing they have to do at the seat of the confessor is to hear the sins of all that present themselves, and to give them with all speed a precipitate absolution; although this divine man [S. Charles] assures us that it is from thence that there has proceeded so much abuse of church privileges and so many sins, the infection of which is so spread in all the arts and in all professions that it seems no longer possible for the greater part of men to practise them without losing their souls. I say no more on this point by way of lamenting so great evils. Groans are more proper than words.

P. 549. "Third part: of some more particular dispositions for communicating with profit. Whether one ought to approach the eucharist without any fear, in any cold state of mind, undevoutness, unfitness for the things of God, deprived of grace, fulness of self-love, the prodigious attachment to the world which is now seen, as this author teaches; and if delay might not serve to produce communicating with more reverence and better dispositions.

purifier par les exercices de la pénitence avant que se présenter au saint autel.

*P. 492, Livre II. c. 37.*

After a long extract from S. Charles : Combien il est criminelle devant Dieu la negligence de ces confesseurs qui se persuadent n'avoir autre chose à faire dans le tribunal de penitence qu'à écouter les péchés de tous ceux qui se présentent et à leur donner aussitôt une absolution précipitée; puisque cet homme divin nous assure que c'est dela que sont procédé tant d'abus et tant de pechés, dont l'infection s'est tellement répandue dans tous les arts et dans toutes les professions, qu'il ne semble quasi plus possible à une grande partie des hommes de les exercer sans s'y perdre... Je n'en dis pas davantage pour deplorer de si grands maux. Les gémissemens sont plus propres que les paroles.

*P. 549.*

Troisieme partie : de quelques dispositions plus particulieres pour communier avec fruit : si l'on doit approcher l'eucharistie sans aucune crainte, dans quelque froideur, indevotion, inapplication aux choses de Dieu, privation de grace, plenitude de l'amour de soi-meme, et prodigieux attachement au monde que l'on se trouve, comme cet auteur enseigne : et si le delai ne peut point servir à communier avec plus de reverence et meilleure disposition.

P. 570. "Words of the author. The disposition necessary to communicate usefully is first grace acquired by contrition, if perchance one had lost it, or by the sacrament of penitence. Many hold that it is absolutely necessary, so that, if one is not in a state of grace, the sacrament has no effect in such a receiver. Some others more probably believe that it is enough not to know one's self to be in mortal sin. However it be, one does not sin in receiving the holy sacrament when conscience does not wound us, and when one does not think that one is in mortal sin. Secondly, one ought to do all one can to be in a devout state; and although one does not feel all that one desires, one ought to humble one's self and so to communicate without fear. M. Arnauld. All reduces itself to this grace acquired by the sacrament of penitence, and this sacrament of penitence has a simple [unfeigned] confession (according to your preceding articles), and that is not absolutely necessary, according to the most probable opinion, but it is enough not to know that one is in mortal sin. [This casuistry has the great fault of being dry and stiff and too much on the lines of church system: in a word, unreformed. See Prof. Ullmann in this Part.]

*The perpetuity of the faith.* Vol. i. 60. "It would be easy to shew, according to the principles of the faith recognized by the holy fathers, that it is not allowed for the sake of any subject to separate one's self from that original mother society with its succession and catholicity; and that instead of concluding that one

P. 570.

Paroles de l'auteur. La disposition nécessaire à communier utilement est premièrement la grâce acquise par la contrition, si d'aventure on l'avoit perdue, ou par le sacrement de pénitence. Plusieurs tiennent qu'il est absolument nécessaire, en sorte que, si on n'est point en grâce, le sacrement n'ait aucun effet en celui qui le reçoit. Quelques autres, plus probablement, croient que c'est assez de ne se reconnoître pas en péché mortel. Quoiqu'il en soit, on ne pèche point en recevant le saint sacrement, lorsque la conscience ne remord point, et qu'on ne pense pas être en péché mortel. Secondement on doit faire ce que l'on peut pour avoir de la dévotion; et encore que l'on ne la resente pas telle que l'on desireroit, on se doit humilier et ainsi communier sans crainte. M. Arnauld. Tout se réduit à cette grâce acquise par le sacrement de penitence, et ce sacrement de penitence à une simple confession selon vos articles précédents; et cela même n'est pas absolument nécessaire, selon l'opinion la plus probable; mais c'est assez de ne se connaître pas en péché mortel.

*La Perpétuité de la Foy de Antoine Arnauld, I. 60, Paris, 1670.*

Il seroit aisé de leur montrer, selon les principes de la foy reconnus par les SS. pères qu'il n'est permis pour aucun sujet de se separer de cette societe matrice originale, successive et Catholique; et qu'au

must become a schismatic from that society, because it teaches such and such errors, one must on the contrary conclude that it does not teach errors; because it is certain that one must not become a schismatic from the church, as the criminality of schism is always more evident than are the pretended errors of which men accuse the church. For there are two equally certain maxims in the faith, that one must separate from a church that holds a corrupt faith, and that one must never separate from the catholic church. But the application of these maxims is not equally sure and certain; and this is why all heretics, through a bad application of the first (maxim) and on a false supposition of the errors attributed by them to the church, have thus concluded that they ought to separate from her; instead of it being clear that they ought never to separate from her, they ought to conclude that what they took for error was not such. [All this writing up of the infallibility of the Roman church or communion did not save M. Arnauld from being persecuted and obliged to retire from the Sorbonne and from Paris, which to him was a synonym for France.]

P. 10. "If one wished to go through some general thinking as to the best methods of overthrowing the foundation of the opinions of the sacramentarians [all who hold that the Lord's supper is a sign and aid, in obtaining grace from God, but do not believe in grace merely, *ex opere operato*, and consequently not in a real presence of the Lord's body in every receiver], one must prove the following points: (1) that the words in which our Lord has instituted the holy sacraments cannot be understood in any but the catholic sense.

---

lieu de conclure qu'il faut faire schisme avec cette eglise, parce qu'elle enseigne telles ou telles erreurs, il faut conclure au contraire qu'elle n'enseigne point d'erreurs; parce qu'il est certain qu'il ne faut jamais faire schisme avec l'eglise...le crime de schisme estant toujours plus evident que les pretendues erreurs dont on accuse l'eglise. Car ce sont deux maximes egalement certaines en foi, qu'il faut se separer d'une eglise corrompue dans la foy, et qu'il ne faut jamais se separer de l'eglise catholique. Mais l'application de ces maximes n'est pas egalement sûre et certaine. Et c'est pourquoi tous les heretiques par une mauvaise application de la premiere, et sur une fausse supposition des erreurs qu'ils attribuoient a l'eglise, en ont conclu qu'ils s'en devoient separer; au lieu qu'estant clair au contraire qu'il ne s'en faut jamais separer, ils doivent conclure que ce qu'ils prenoient pour erreur ne l'estoit pas.

*I. p. 10. Preface.*

Si l'on vouloit penser en general au moyens de ruiner les fondemens de l'opinion des Sacramentaires... il faudra prouver les points suivans, (1) Que les paroles par lesquelles J. C. a institué le saint sacrement ne se peuvent entendre que dans le sens des Catholiques.

P. 11. "They may see in l. x. c. 1 and others, &c...of the true sense of 'This is My body.' [This chapter is on the belief of the real presence in the Greek and other churches.] (2) That the words of the fathers in which they say that the eucharist is the body of Jesus Christ cannot be understood and have not been understood by them, except concerning the true body of Christ, and not of a typical and symbolical body, &c. (3) The extreme difference between the expressions either of the Scripture or of the fathers...which the catholics use and those which Albertin compares with them, &c. (4) That these solutions of 'a virtue' and 'a figure' are vain, frivolous, and unknown by all Christians in the world. (5) That the fathers' expressions...shew that they were persuaded of this doctrine. (6) The difference of the customs that prevailed...the silence of the fathers on certain points ...do not prove them to have been of any other belief than ours.

I. 730. "That they suffer the decision of this dispute to be left to experience itself. I consult then not my own impressions, nor theirs, but those of such as have not taken part in our disputes, and I find that this figurative sense which they call natural and easy, never rose up in the judgment of any of those that have sought for the sense of these words for the first 1000 years. [Extraordinary assertion, when a large part of the writings of Augustine on this subject is fairly and fully considered; to say nothing of Athanasius, Theodore and others with less unity of view.]

P. 729. "It is certain that Jesus Christ has not spoken to be

P. 11.

On fait voir dans le premier chapitre du dixieme livre et des autres, &c...du vrai sens de "Ceci est mon corps," &c. (2) Que les paroles des peres dans lesquelles ils disent que "l'Eucharistie est le corps de J. C." &c., ne se peuvent entendre et n'ont esté entendues par eux que du vrai corps de J. C. et non d'un corps typique et symbolique, &c. (3) Extreme difference entre les expressions ou de l'Ecriture ou des peres ... dont les catholiques se servent, et celles qu'Aubertin compare, &c. (4) Que ces... solutions de *vertu* et de figure...sont vaines frivoles et inconnues a tous les Chretiens du monde. (5) Que les expressions des Peres...qu'ils ont esté persuadez de cette doctrine. (6) Difference des pratiques...silence des peres sur certains points...ne preuvent qu'ils ayent esté dans une autre creance que nous.

*Vol. I. p. 730.*

Qu'ils souffrent qu'on remette la decision de cette dispute a l'experience mesme. Je consulte donc, non mon impression, ny la leur, mais celle de ceux qui non point de part a nos disputes; et je trouve que ce sens de figure qu'ils appellent naturel et facile, *n'est jamais venu dans l'esprit, mille ans durant, d'aucun de ceux, qui ont suivi le sens de ces paroles.*

P. 729.

Il est certain que J. C. n'a point parlé pour n'estre entendu que par

understood only by philosophers and metaphysicians. Such are on the contrary the last whom He desired to make understand these Divine truths ; for they are the men whose ways are most opposed to the ways of the faith. He has set forth that His religion would be followed by an infinite number of simple folk—of women and children—of persons that reason but little and who do not get into the depths of things ... and this is what one sees in the consensus of all Christian societies in the faith of the real presence, which we have proved so much at large in this volume.” [Sacramentarians claim that this argument now tells very much on their side.]

The sentences of this learned man are so long, that I could not find room for any of his citations from the Remonstrant party, nor even for quotations from Socinians, which shew that some of them hold that this sacrament sets forth to us, and is, a special mode of obtaining from God, grace that refreshes and strengthens the soul, as bread and wine do to our bodies. Others no doubt fall short of this view, as did Bishop Hoadley and Pelagius.

But both these treatises cast a strong light on the moral corruption and doctrinal perversion of the times. I read in Miss Martin's nice volume, that at Port Royal they had received the communion in one day as often as seventeen times ; but the monstrous abuse contended for by Père Noué is a warning to our times ; and the entire treatise, in spite of the pervading mechanical character of its preparations for the supper, has many a word of wisdom against unfit communicating. The second and longer treatise is perhaps less serviceable, not only because it takes the church from age to age for the mistress of our faith, which must be built on our intelligent and prayerful convictions of the true sense of Scripture, but also because it assumes that the fathers give us a sufficient reflexion of the opinions of the mass of believers in every age, which is an utterly unwarrantable assumption. Who could take the eccentric but noble Origen, and the staunch high-churchman Cyprian, as being a sufficient representation of all the various churches of

---

des philosophes et des metaphysiciens ; ce sont au contraire les derniers de ceux a qui Il a voulu faire entendre ces divines veritez ; parce que ce sont ceux dont les voyes sont plus opposées aux voyes de la foy. Il a pretendu que Sa religion seroit suivie par une infinite de gens simples, de femmes, d'enfans, de personnes qui raisonnent peu et qui n'approfondissent pas les choses...et c'est ce que l'on voit par le consentement de toutes les societes Chretiennes dans la foy de la presence réelle que nous avons prouvée avec tant d'étendue dans ce volume.

believers in Asia and Africa in the third century? The idea is wholly inadmissible: and so of the ages before and after. A few leaves survive, in a kind of hortus siccus, but the mass of the foliage of trees of all sorts, in successive ages, is a matter of pure imagination in these modern times. On every ground patristic literature is not a sufficient guide, but the Bible is; for we can implicitly trust it, as it is of God.

Of the two treatises the larger, *i.e.* the one on the perpetuity of the patristic belief on the Lord's supper, is erected upon a foundation of sand; as in this volume it has been my task to shew; and therefore it carries less weight, though its display of patristic learning may be both interesting and serviceable: but the shorter treatise in answer to Père Noué has an historic place, and is on a point of the greatest interest still. Its historical interest is that it is a very important part of the series of attacks, under which at last the Jesuits fell even in France, the chief kingdom of the Papacy, in less than 100 years (in 1764). But it has a never-dying interest, in that it deals with a question which is now rising up before the English public: *viz.* Who ought to communicate? and Is there any principle on which to regulate the frequency of communions in each several church? For what is this but the question agitated between Noué and Arnauld with rejoinders on both sides, "Ought Communions to be frequent or seldom, and under what rules, direction or advice?"

#### (R.) THE ARNAULDS OF PORT ROYAL.

The united labour of this family for the reform of convents, or as they were then called, monasteries, is I believe without a parallel. It reminds one of Ovid's line about the Fabii, *Una domus vires et onus susceperat urbis*. From Angelique the eldest daughter made coadjutrix in 1599 to Agnes, who died last of all the six sisters in 1671, *i.e.* for a period of 72 years, the whole of the Arnauld influence was concentrated in this undertaking, until father, mother, and almost all of the four sons were incorporated in it. And at times it was doubtful whether large success would not be attained in spite of the full tide of circumfluent wickedness in high places. And yet you may read books in the interest of the Roman Communion regarding this period, and the names of this family and of Port Royal do not appear. Rome has abol-



ished them out of her history as she destroyed the very foundations of their Abbey. I read a modern life of Francis of Sales. His visits to Angelique Arnauld and her family are not mentioned. I search the life prefixed to the French edition of his works in five vols. : there is no mention of her or of Port Royal. Why is this ? After the death of that second St Francis, Angelique found a congenial spiritual director in Jean Du Vergier, Monk of St Cyran, and he was the fellow-student of Jansenius. After repeated failures the Jesuits succeeded in wringing from the Roman church a condemnation of five propositions on Grace, selected from his work, Augustinus ; by which he hoped to amend the time after the teaching of that eminent father. The propositions themselves are about as far from being lucid and true as from being hurtful above the common run of propositions on that subject. But the monk St Cyran had exhibited symptoms of a desire for the improvement of current errors. That was enough ; and all Christendom must denounce Jansenius ; and all who would not sign the condemnation of these propositions must perish. The staunch Port Royalists could not consent to condemn St Cyran on topics quite beyond their knowledge : and *delenda erat Carthago*. They and their two Port Royal Abbeys must perish ; their surviving members must be dispersed, one by one, and made to sign the anathema with their dying hands, it is said "with their dead fingers ;" and their very memory, if Jesuit power can accomplish it, must perish. A more heartless cruelty it is not easy to discover. For the extracts from their history in relation to the Lord's supper shew to how unusual an extent in the direction of Roman doctrine they had carried their opinions on that crucial question. In fact the first thing that raised a question about the full claims of the Roman Communion, was the imprisonment and death in prison, after five years' incarceration, of their beloved and venerated spiritual teacher St Cyran. Could a church, at whose bidding Richelieu destroyed so good and so wise an adviser, be in all things infallibly right ? This doubt was almost the whole of Angelique's Protestantism, and none of her sisters went so far. However the opposition drew down upon the heads of the Jesuit body the immortal Provincial Letters of Pascal and the 48 or 50 volumes of Angelique's youngest brother, who has acquired the name of the great Arnauld. The one error of Jansenius is that very excusable one of endeavouring simply to Augustinize the age. But the

Bible itself is the only unalloyed and sufficient antidote for a corrupted time.

Yet the names of the sisters are a sacred heritage. Catherine, who married M. le Maitre d'Andilly, and who, after the establishment of her children, joined with her husband in all possible co-operation : Angelique and Agnes, made abbesses in one day : Anne, and Marie, Clair, and last Madeleine. All but the last endowed with a love of work and a staunch firmness of principle of no common order, and supplying to them no common power. Doctrinal points were assumed by them : but in moral and devotional fidelity they stooped to no compromises. It was only in the pursuing these excellencies that they ran into methods that we can see to be alike against the Bible and the interests of society.

*F. Martin's Life of Angelique Arnauld.*

C. XIV. Institution of an order of the holy eucharist. Nuns' house opened near the Louvre in Paris, 1633, by A. A., with three nuns and four postulants. Pope Urban VIII. sanctioned the order six years before, and the French king Louis XIV. consented in 1630, through the urgency of Mme Longueville on being raised from a serious illness. P. 199, "As many as seventeen or eighteen "masses were sometimes said in a day." All "were present at "every service if possible." P. 220, the Bishop of Langres complained of M. de S. Cyran "that he had *hindered* the sisters from "partaking of the holy communion." I do not find anything in Jansen's Augustinus on the Lord's supper ; which is very singular. It was published 1640. The paper on "frequent communion" was put forth three years after. P. 258. A. A.'s life. "A Jesuit "priest saw some of the instructions written by St Cyran for the "Princess de Guemené, and said they were much too strict. In a "letter which the Jesuit wrote to prove his assertions he stated "among other things that the less we have of grace the more "boldly we ought to approach the table of the Lord, and that those "who are entirely engrossed by the love of the world and self "ought to communicate very frequently. Now in the Romish "church communion must be preceded by confession and absolu- "tion ; and, if this doctrine be accepted, pardoned and impenitent "sinners may be absolved and receive the holy eucharist without "repentance, &c. Arnauld... wrote an answer to the Jesuit's "work on 'frequent communion.'... A Jesuit attacked the book "(of M. Arnauld) in a course of sermons, and forbade any of his "hearers to look at it... The first edition was sold in a fortnight "... and a second was announced in an advertisement affixed to "the doors of the Jesuit college before the reverend father had

"finished his course of sermons." The book is in five thick quarto volumes. "Marshal de Vitri was present at one of the sermons, "and said afterwards he was quite sure there was more than "appeared on the surface in this matter, for the reverend fathers "never shewed such extraordinary zeal when there was nothing at "stake but the glory of God." A hard saying, but the truth is worse; *viz.* that in the history of these times the Jesuits shew that they really seem to have deserved this sharp reproach. Chap. XXI. p. 262, on Mme A. retiring to Port Royal, the funds of the Holy Eucharist convent were transferred to it with the Pope's sanction, 1645, and instead of the black robe a white one was required with a scarlet cross, pendant. P. 263, "The design ... "perpetual adoration of the mystery of the holy eucharist was not "abandoned."

One grieves over the tearing up of Port Royal: but perhaps the effort of that marvellous family the Arnaulds was so much adulterated by the gross superstition which then prevailed and divided the empire over the nation with the grossest licentiousness—that it could not be preserved. It had the good and the bad against it at once.

If anyone, charmed with the many superior excellences that arose in the calm retirement of Port Royal, should feel as the writer did, that he longs beyond all things that some representation of the persons of this remarkable Angelique and her sisters survived to assist in forming and realizing a conception of the way in which they went about their daily ministrations in the Abbey, such idealists may be gratified to know that, at the heading of the text in many of the volumes of the edition cited, are family groups, apparently of the sisters themselves and of their mother: nor will such earnest idealizers of the past find it difficult to determine by the positions or by some other indicative mark, which is Angelique, and which Agnes, and which the sister who, being intellectually inferior, became mistress of the culinary department, for she bears a pair of scales, and which is the sister, who was warned by François de Sales not to think much of her beauty, for she carries a looking-glass; so that among those that remain it is not difficult to identify with all probability both the mother and Madame d'Andilly the married sister, for the endowment of whom Angelique and Agnes were disposed of by obtaining abbacies for them at a very early age. This was done for them as the only possible course: since the family property was deemed inade-

quate to the maintenance of more than one of the sisters in the position proper for the Arnaulds. But one cannot fail to observe how this custom of making a sacrifice of the sweet capabilities of family affections in the junior daughters upon the altar of family greatness was in this case overruled for the reform of this seat of religious retirement, till it became a green oasis of real godliness for Parisian ladies to flee to and find God and Christ and the Holy Spirit and a living church, during the wicked dissoluteness of a French reign, in which Jesuitism was dominant in the capital. It was a crowning mercy at last to get such a religious confessor as M. Duvergier d'Hauranne, a gentleman of high family and Jansenius' bosom friend. Then we have to trace the signal mercy in the kindling of the same light in several of the gentlemen of the Arnauld family, who, as they could not enter, lived outside the abbey, and last and greatest comes the youngest brother Antoine.

(S.) BISHOP JEREMY TAYLOR. B. 1613. D. 1667.

I am fain to characterize him by citing Bishop Heber's estimate of him, which must needs carry the weight of *laus a laudato viro*. Hooker claims the foremost rank in sustained and classic dignity of style, in political and pragmatistical wisdom: to Barrow the praise must be assigned of the clearest views, and of a taste the most controlled and chastened: but in imagination, in interest, in that which more properly and exclusively deserves the name of genius, Taylor is to be placed before either. The first awes most, the second convinces most; the third persuades and delights most; and according to the decision of one whose own rank among the ornaments of English literature yet remains to be determined by posterity (Dr Parr in his Spital sermon) Hooker is the object of our reverence, Barrow of our admiration, and Jeremy Taylor of our love. *Ὁκηρὸν μὲν σέβω, θαυμάζω δὲ Βάρρων, καὶ φιλῶ Ταιλωρόν.* Life by Heber, Vol. II. p. 183.

If Alexander envied Achilles the immortal record of his eminence by Homer, even Jeremy Taylor's memory may be thought fortunate in having for his biographer that Indian prelate, whom the late Archdeacon Robinson so lovingly photographed in his short memorial volume. But Dr Samuel Parr's famous saying may outlive his own Spital Sermon. I fancy I like it better in

Heber's paraphrase which was just now cited than in Parr's stiff Greek. I fancy Browning's testimony is touched with the truth,

"Where bee-like in the flowers I may bury me,  
Like Taylor's, the immortal Jeremy."

I will add nothing to these testimonies except that Miss Manning has with a lady's touch more skilfully set him by Milton's side in beautiful contrast in her *Maiden and Married Life of Mary Powell*. One would like to spend days in dreaming by the Irish Lake, and at the Golden Grove, and at other spots immortalised by this singularly rich but somewhat lavish and unkempt genius: and methinks all good feelings would grow warmer and all noble convictions stronger and higher. It has been said by Coleridge of St Paul, and perhaps no one besides Jeremy deserves to have it said of him, that in them the tender grace and intuition of one sex is found in union with the strength and reasoning power of the other. But neither Taylor nor Hooker gives us the pure sense of Scripture upon the Lord's supper, like the second of Dr Parr's triad, Dr Barrow. Taylor was a sizar of Caius, and became chaplain to Laud: and was sent from London to be Bishop of Down, Connor and Dromore.

*Polemical Discourses, On the Real Presence.* London, 1674.

P. 226. "Let this be added that in Scripture it is as plainly affirmed to be bread, as it is called Christ's body; now then because it cannot be both in the proper and natural sense, but one of them must be figurative and tropical; since both of the appellatives are equally affirmed, it is notorious that in this case we ought to give judgment on that side to which we are prompted by common sense. If Christ had said only 'This is My body,' and no apostle had told also that it is bread, we had reason to suspect our senses to be deceived, if it were possible they should be. But when it is equally affirmed to be bread, as to be our Lord's body, and but one of them can be naturally true and in the letter, then shall the testimony of our senses be of no use in casting the balance? The two affirmatives are equal. One must be expounded tropically. Which will you choose? Is there anything in the world more certain and expedite than that what you see, and feel, and taste natural and proper, should be judged to be that you feel and taste naturally and properly, and that therefore the other should be expounded tropically?...The man that must answer all, I mean Bellarmine, ventures something,

saying, It was good argument of our blessed Saviour, 'Handle Me, and see that I am no spirit.' That which is seen and handled, is no spirit. But it is no good argument to say, 'This is not seen, not handled; therefore it is no body; and therefore the body of Christ may be sacrament, though it is not seen nor handled.' To this I reply, this is the affirmative consequent of our blessed Lord... It is I, for by the feeling and seeing you shall believe it to be so; and it is bread, for by feeling and seeing and tasting and smelling it, you shall perceive it to be so. It is remarkable that our blessed Lord did not only by feeling and seeing, prove it to be a body; but by proving it was His body He proved it was Himself, *i.e.*, by these accidents representing My person, and so the accidents of bread declare a latent body, meaning the body of Christ... How had He proved that He was no spirit by shewing a body which might be the case of a spirit, *but that it is not* consistent with the wisdom and goodness of God to suffer any illusion in any matter of sense relating to an article of faith... *Letter at end of these discourses.* We may not render Divine worship to Him as present in the blessed sacrament or host, according to His human nature, without danger of idolatry, because He is not there according to His human nature, and therefore you give Divine worship to a non-ens, which must needs be idolatry. [Cited by Wake, p. 89...]

P. 184. "By presenting spiritually we mean, to our spirits only.

P. 183. "A spirit is also a real presence.

P. 185. "Hardest...is corporaliter; but the expression may become warrantable, and mean no more than *really and without fiction*.

P. 184. "The word substantialiter may be a substance, but after a sacramental manner, *i.e. really, truly*, without fiction, or the help of fancy. [What playing with words this is!]

P. 183. "If by virtue of these words really, substantially, corporeally, verily and indeed, and Christ's body and blood, the fathers shall be supposed to speak for transubstantiation they may as well suppose it to be our doctrine too, for *we speak the same words* [More is the pity, *e.g.* to say Christ is *corporeally* present in the Lord's supper, and to say that you only mean that it is not fiction], and therefore these authorities [*i.e.* the fathers] would signify nothing against us, unless these words can be proved *in them* to signify more than our sense of them does import."

We are suffering through the improper adoption of terms by which many fathers plainly meant a change of the bread into Christ's body, and not after a merely typical, figurative, or sa-

cramental manner, *i.e.* after the manner of a *sign*; and now this noble but rather imaginative divine says, (1) we use the same terms as the fathers; therefore we may assume that they meant no more than we. Ans. You ought not to adopt their terms—for (2) if Jeremy Taylor says we must prove that the fathers used those terms with a different meaning from ours, our answer is—We accept the saying in reference not to our opinion, but to the language of Scripture by Jesus and Paul: and page by page we shew in the fathers point after point exceeding and subverting the simple views of our Master on this subject: in a word that the fathers Judaised the simple typical and commemorative feast into a sacrifice ministered by a priest upon an altar in a temple, and supplying forgiveness of sins to the communicant; and subsequent practice added solitary masses celebrated for the absent, dead or living, by the unit, the decad, the hundred, the thousand, and then came up purgatory and indulgences from the common stock of superfluous merit accumulated by special Saints beyond what God required of them. Once grant the mass a sacrifice and all the rest follows in regular sequence. We must therefore go to the pure fountain and start afresh there.

In the same Vol. II. of the *Life* by Bishop Heber, begins at p. 69, an argument by him against some points in Jeremy Taylor, which with great facility anticipates what has been laboriously contended for in these two volumes upon those points. Heber quotes from Taylor's *Real Presence and Spiritual of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament* proved against the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, as follows, "The symbols become changed into the body and blood of Christ after a sacramental, *i.e.* a spiritual real manner, so that "all that worthily communicate do by faith receive Christ really, "effectually, and to all the purposes of His passion." The terms of Taylor here expressly advocate what several other writers affirm to be the doctrine of the Church of England, and which was a few years since generally receiving the name of Receptionism, though it really is *one mode* of Receptionism. I can give only portions of Bishop Heber's clear and full reply. "With sacramental in this sense [*i.e.* as a sign] the term *real* is utterly inconsistent." This he elucidates, and adds, "It is not correct to say "that any change has taken place in their nature, though they "have undoubtedly become the means of our obtaining a spiritual "blessing." Then in p. 71, "The word *real*, as Taylor has intro-

“duced it, is unmeaning or worse; inasmuch as for the elements “to be *really* changed into the body and blood of Christ is the “very thing for which the Romanists plead, and which is at “complete variance with Taylor’s previous statement as well as “with all his subsequent arguments:” and in p. 73 he concludes, “It is plain then that our Reformers, in denying the *bodily* change “of the elements, admitted no *real* change in them at all &c.” It is much to be regretted that the great author of Dissuasives from Popery did not, like Heber, discriminate thus. But non omnia possumus. There are spots in our brightest suns.

Another short passage I add from Bishop Heber, p. 72. “What “indeed is the meaning of anything being present under its symbols and representations, unless it be that the thing itself is not “there, but that there is something else which supplies its place? “Or what but this can be the meaning of the *spiritual* presence “of a *substance*?” And p. 75, he writes, “If the eating were “*bodily*, and the elements, as the Romanists pretend, were changed “in *substance*, the wicked might eat Christ as well as the worthy “communicant.” In pp. 70, 71, is an analysis of the term “spiritual.” In fact there is very much in this testimony of Bishop Heber in which he quite ran beyond both his own age and ours in specific Biblical accuracy.

*Sermon before the University of Dublin. Heber’s Life. Vol. I. 184, Vol. VI. 878, Heber’s Edition of Taylor’s works.*

“What learning is it to discourse on the philosophy of the sacrament if you do not feel the virtues of it: and the man that can with eloquence and subtilty discourse of the instrumental efficacy of baptismal waters, *talks ignorantly*, in respect of him who hath ‘the answer of a good conscience within,’ and is cleansed by the purification of the Spirit, &c. &c. How can a wicked man understand the purities of the heart? And how can an evil and unworthy communicant tell what it is to have received Christ by faith, to dwell with Him, to be united to Him, to receive Him in his heart? The good man alone understands that. The one sees the colour, the other feels the substance. The one discourses of the sacrament, the other receives Christ. The one discourses *for* or *against* transubstantiation; but the good man feels himself to be changed, and so joined to Christ that he alone understands the true sense of transubstantiation while he becomes to Christ bone of His bone, flesh of His flesh, and of the same spirit with his Lord. To you fathers, and brethren, who are or intend to be of the clergy, you see here the best compendium of



your studies, the best abbreviature of your labours, the truest method of wisdom, and the infallible, the only way of judging the disputes and questions in Christendom. It is not by reading multitudes of books, but by *studying the truth of God*. It is not by laborious commentaries of the doctors that you can finish your work; but by the expositions of the Spirit of God. It is not by the rules of metaphysic, but by the proportions of holiness: and when all books are read, and all arguments examined, and all authorities alleged, nothing can be found to be true that is unholy. [All this is pure gold, fit to be set in the Irish Church's council chamber.]

P. 187. "The great learning of the fathers was more owing to their piety than to their skill, &c. &c. Where is the blessed choir of bishops and doctors, who shined like lights in the world, and contained the word of life? Dulce est meminisse, their very memory is pleasant. Where is that Evodias the sweet savour of the church and the successor and imitator of the holy apostles? Where is Ignatius, in whom God dwelt? Where is St Dionysius the Areopagite, that bird of Paradise, that celestial eagle? Where is Hippolytus, that good man, *ἀνὴρ χρηστός*, that gentle sweet person? Where is great St Basil, a man almost equal to the apostles? Where is Athanasius, rich in virtue? Where is Gregory Nyssen, that great divine? And Ephrem, the great Syrian, that stirred up the sluggish and awakened the sleepers, and comforted the afflicted, and brought the young men to discipline, the looking-glass of the religious, the captain of the penitents, the destruction of heresies, the receptacle of graces, the habitation of the Holy Ghost. These were the men that prevailed against error, because they lived according to truth: and whosoever shall oppose you and the truth you walk by, may better be confuted by your lives than by your disputations, &c. &c. But if ye live wickedly and scandalously, every little schismatic shall put you to shame, and draw disciples after him, and abuse your flocks, and feed them with colocynth and hemlock, and place heresy in the chairs appointed for your religion." [A piece of Christian eloquence as essentially true and nearly the same as to facts in detail as the equally splendid pieces of the fathers.]

(T.) DR HENRY MORE. B. 1614. D. 1687.

He was a native of Grantham and was educated at Eton, and went to Christ's, Cambridge, where he devoted himself to general research, which ended in his coming forth a Platonist of the first water. The form for refusing the episcopal office was used in his

instance regarding several of the highest pieces of preferment which the English Church could offer. He preferred private study to any public official life whatever. He was rated nevertheless at his true value, being also generally loved, and his works were greatly admired. He is generally named as the author of the Divine Dialogues : but his poem, *The Life of the Soul*, is also a favourite work. In a book of Tracts on the Lord's Supper, from the library of the late Duke of Sussex, in the midst of treatises by Payne, Claggett, Wake (which are also found in Bishop Gibson's work), I find the treatise of Dr More, from which the following extracts are taken.

"But Dr More adds, It does not at all follow...that we must hold that that very body of Christ that hung upon the cross...is really present in the sacrament, &c. P. 7, John vi. v. 61—63, Does this offend you? &c. Then My particular natural body will be far enough removed from you, and yourselves then from so gross a conceit as to think I understand this of My natural particular body or flesh. No, says He. The flesh profiteth nothing. It is the Spirit that quickens, &c., &c. [To my mind nothing can be more satisfactory than these sentences by which the Doctor teaches that the real natural body of Christ—the *res ipsa*—the *verum corpus*, &c., "are in heaven *and not here*." But how then can the Doctor maintain as before stated the real presence (not of Christ which might be misunderstood but) of *His body and blood* in the supper? See p. 33.] If they had kept to the profession of it in general and had defined no further than the plain Scriptural text, John vi., and the primitive fathers had warranted them, *viz.* that there was a *twofold body and blood of Christ*; the one natural, the other spiritual and Divine, which we do really receive in the holy communion, &c., &c. [see next p. 37], such a Divine body and blood of Christ as is universal, not restrained to His particular human nature, but belonging to Him as He is the eternal Logos, in Whom is the ζωή, life or spirit, which goeth along with the Divine body of this life or spirit of Christ, and consequently is rightly called His body.

So at last Dr More has brought us to this, that the Son of God is from all eternity clothed with a body, and that *this* is the body given to believers in the supper. I will only say (1) that I am glad he just here leaves out the words "and His blood," though logic requires their insertion, and (2) I think in asserting that the Eternal Son has a body, he, to say the least, is "intruding into "things that he hath not seen ;" and yet this is his only escape from

the assertion, and the only escape for many of the primitive fathers from the charge of holding that Christ's very natural body is given to be eaten in the supper of the Lord, though the bread appears only bread, &c. I do not mean that most of the fathers plead Tillotson's view, though some stand on the border of it, when and in whatever mode they assert that we receive the Logos. I think the real presence of Christ's body had better be renounced.

Perhaps it is hardly right to let these extracts pass without a few words more—not upon his unjustifiable assertions (1) that the Eternal Son had from eternity a body, so far like ours that it is continually restored from waste by that wonderful fluid blood, and (2) that *that body* is given to us to eat, and *that blood* to drink in the supper of the Lord; since our article describes God without body, parts or passions, and the Bible says that even in our case flesh and blood cannot enter the kingdom of Heaven. But I would rather direct attention to the extraordinary difficulty to which divines are put who must needs affirm something *more* than the figurative sense of Christ's words, This is My body, &c., and “the spiritual refreshing of the soul” of which it is a figure, and yet would fain hold something less than Popery of the 13th and 16th centuries. It seems to me that there is no standing-ground, no level spot between the one and the other on which belief can build. All that is erected in the mid-space slides or falls over gradually into the latter.

*A brief discourse of the Real Presence, &c.* London, 1686.

P. 2. “Transubstantiation, into which they would bring back the Reformed Church by taking hold of some...professions of theirs of a real presence (though they absolutely deny the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation), and thus entangling and insnaring them... would by hard pulling hale them into that...error, for which and several others they rightly left the communion of the church of Rome, &c. I thought it my duty so far as my age and infirmness of my body will permit...to shew there is no clashing betwixt declaring against transubstantiation and those passages which seem to imply a real presence. [I have in several places, as here, shortened sentences that run to an exorbitant length. This fills 29 lines.]

P. 3. “Now those passages which seem to imply a real presence in the eucharist [p. 2, a real presence of the *body* and *blood* of Christ at the celebration of the holy eucharist]. (1) Article 28, The body of Christ, saith our church, is given, taken and eaten in the supper *only* after an Heavenly and spiritual manner. [I

venture to say this needs not discussion. It is and was intended for a direct denial of any presence of Christ's real natural body and blood in the Lord's supper.] (2) In our catechism, The body and blood of Christ which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's supper. Where *verily* and *indeed* seems to imply a real presence and participation of the body and blood of Christ. (3) The Homily on worthily receiving, &c. Thus much we must be sure to hold that in the supper of the Lord there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, *no untrue figure of a thing absent*, &c. [In this (3), the thing absent is, by the whole context, the real natural body and blood of Jesus.] Our adversaries who would by this hook pluck us back again into the error of transubstantiation, will unavoidably imagine and allege from hence that, if we will stand to the assertions of our own church, we must acknowledge the real presence of the body and blood of our Saviour in the sacrament." [I certainly must affirm that the adversaries rightly lay *this latter* to their charge. A person may indeed object to the word transubstantiation invented in a comparatively late age; but if he very expressly asserts, as Hilary first and many fathers following did, that the bread is the very body of Christ, &c., he does not fall short of maintaining that the bread is removed, except in appearance, and the body of Christ put in its stead.]

(U.) DR JOHN OWEN. B. 1616. D. 1683.

That he was a magnificent man to represent the Independent body in the time of their ascendancy at Oxford University must, I think, be admitted by friends and foes. Possibly had he never filled the posts of Chancellor of Oxford University and Dean of Christchurch he would have been a profounder and more accurate divine. Robert Hall, who was too great to be meanly jealous, severely depreciated his writings. Certainly two truly Christian men of genius could hardly differ more in expressing views essentially identical, the sectarian points of opposition notwithstanding. I suppose no one ever went to the Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, or to any of Owen's great treatises, without being enriched. But often one has come away with Hall's regret that such a writer should so often dream away into a sleepy diffusiveness. Dr Chalmers' favourable estimate of Owen is seen in his preface to Owen's treatise on Indwelling Sin; and if anyone, after dwelling for a time in the clouds of philosophical mist, wherewith it is now the fashion to cover and extinguish the doctrine of the

Bible on the Atonement, will honestly give himself to the teachings of Owen upon it, he will soon find the atmosphere clearing, and himself standing on a peak of high thought, and all the rest of the glories of revealed truth shining around him in full view, and each in its place.

The marvel is that Owen, and his rivals and followers in what is worthy to be called Puritan theology, did not trouble themselves closely to analyse Scripture on the Lord's supper. We as well as they are great losers by their not having done so. Owen's modern successors are happily not generally imitating him in this omission. On the contrary, when the struggle comes, we hope to see nearly all of them on the side of the Scripture and of simplicity in ritual and doctrine. Owen had much of the freedom of a son of Yorkshire. Queen's at Oxford was his college. He held successively the livings of Fordham and Coggeshall. Unable to give the unhappy king credit for the prime Christian virtue of veracity, we are yet free to wish that Owen had not been the man to preach the sermon before the dominant House of Commons after the king's execution. But many believe that Cromwell was not the man who least regretted that the parliamentary army would be satisfied with nothing less than the royal blood. The restored monarch was certainly in every way ruined by being brought up abroad. Continental depravity and unbelief, not concerned enough about religion to take the form of infidelity, made the third Stuart king the worst and the most dangerous of the four. If it be true that Puritans were driven to an extreme of unworldliness in some respects, a counterpoise to the tendency of the times was certainly wanted to keep society from falling over into utter irreligion and immoral living.

*Principles of the Doctrine of Christ. Works, Vol. V. London, 1823.*

P. 33. "What are the seals of the New Testament? Sacraments instituted of Christ to be visible seals and pledges, whereby God in Him confirmeth the promise of the covenant to all believers, restipulating them in growth in faith and obedience, &c. How doth God by these sacraments bestow grace upon us? *Not by any real essential conveying of spiritual grace by corporal means*, but by the way of promise, obsignation and confirming the grace wrought in us by the word and Spirit, &c. This is one of the great mysteries of the Roman magic and juggling: that corporal elements *should have power* to forgive sins and convey spiritual

grace. How do our sacraments differ from the sacraments of the Jews? Accidentally only, &c.

P. 35. "What is the Lord's supper? A holy action instituted and appointed by Christ to set forth His death and *communicate* unto His people spiritually *His body and blood* by faith, being represented by bread and wine blessed by His word and prayer, broken, poured out, and received of believers... Whence is the right use of it to be learned? From the word, practice and actions of our Saviour as to its institution. Whatever is more than these is of our own. No part of Christ's religion was ever so vilely contaminated and abused as this pure, holy and plain institution of our Saviour... There is not any one action pertaining to the spiritual nature of His sacrament, not any end put upon it by Christ... but requireth faith, grace and holiness in the receiver.

XVI. 63. "It is a universal unimpeachable persuasion among all Christians, that there is a near intimate communion with Christ and participation of Him in the supper of the Lord... Hence from the beginning this was always esteemed the principal mystery in the agenda of the church, and that deservedly, as the communication of Christ herein and our participation of Him are expressed in such a manner as to demonstrate them to be peculiar; such as are not to be obtained in any other way of Divine ordinance whatever. There is in it an eating and drinking of the body and blood of Christ with a spiritual incorporation thence ensuing, which are peculiar to this ordinance. But this especial and peculiar communion with Christ and participation of Him is spiritual and mystical, by faith, not carnal or fleshly. To imagine any other participation of Christ in this life by faith is to overthrow the Gospel. To look for any other communication of Christ's body and His blood, but what is spiritual, is to contradict Him in the interpretation which He gives of His own word... It doth not only act, itself, by a subjection of the soul and contradicts the authority of Christ in the inspiration, but respects also the exertion of His authority in the close of His prophetic and entrance on the exercise of His sacerdotal office... This is peculiar unto the ordinance... and faith gives an intimate communion with Christ. [Owen is one of those writers who when the subject is delicate and difficult often have resort to luxuriant verbiage, and consequently he seems to mingle pointed truths with ambiguous and nebulous assertions.]... Truths concerning Christ contracted into this ordinance... Their taste and efficacy is more eminent and communicative... than as merely proposed by parts and parcels in the word... It is faith alone that apprehends the sacramental union that is between the outward signs and the things signified... the *body and blood* of Christ are *really* exhibited and *communicated* to the *souls* of believers, as the outward signs

unto the bodily senses—the signs becoming thereby, sacramentally, to us, what the things signified are in themselves; and are therefore called by their names. Herein is a peculiar exercise of faith and a peculiar participation of Christ, such as are in no other ordinance whatever. [N.B. Any peculiarity in the kind of grace in the Lord's supper from grace received in other ways I have found much doubted by many and denied by not a few. At any rate it is an arbitrary assertion. All the peculiarity may be in the manner of its preparing the heart to receive.] Though they [the outward signs] *do not* contain carnally the flesh and blood of Christ, yet they *really* exhibit Christ unto them that believe, in the participation of Him...Faith is the grace that makes the soul to receive Christ...and it receives Him according as He is proposed and exhibited in the declaration and promise of the gospel. It receives Him by the gracious assent of the mind unto the truth; the choice of Him, cleaving and trusting unto Him, with the will, heart and affection for all the ends of His passion and offices as the Mediator between God and man and in the sacramental mysterious proposal of Him...*i.e.* in the efficacy of His death and sacrifice...This is peculiar unto this ordinance.

P. 66. "Of this blessed and intimate communion with Christ believers are partakers to their ineffable joy...They discern the truth of this mystery [spiritual incorporation with Christ] and have experience of its power...Indeed there is nothing in it but unto faith: as the limit of the earth is nothing unto them that have no eyes. A dog and a staff are of more use to a blind man than the Sun...The wits of men were hard put to it to find out this spiritual communion, whereof in their minds they could have no experience. Yet they fashioned one by degrees: and after they had greatened the mystery in words and expressions, to answer unto what was to be set up in the room of it...they brought forth transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the mass. Thereby they provided that all...should be turned into things carnal. Bread shall be the body of Christ carnally. The mouth shall be faith...and the priest shall offer Christ unto God...Because there is a singular mystery...they have invented for the representation thereof such a prodigious imagination of the real conversion or transubstantiation of the substance of that bread and wine into the substance of the body and blood of Christ as overthrows all faith, reason and sense also...an idolatrous worship and adoration of the host, as they call it, to the ruin of the souls of men. This image, like that of Nebuchadnezzar, was once set up in this nation, with a law that whosoever would not bow down to it and worship it shall be cast into the fiery furnace. God grant it to be so no more.

Vol. XXI. p. 38. "To neglect an enquiring after these things, *i.e.* on the part of ministers, respecting the people's having re-

pentance, faith, and obedience in those that are to be admitted unto the table of the Lord is to prostitute the holy ordinance of the gospel unto contempt and abuse...*If in the course of their unholiness...you give them pledges of their salvation by Him, they will not much regard your other exhortations.* The church is damaged by the neglect of a careful *inspection* into their duty. It cannot be but that ignorance, worldliness and profaneness will spread themselves as a leprosy over such a church...Hereby do churches, which should be the glory of Christ...become the principal means and occasions of His dishonour in the world...and it is a matter of no small amazement that any churches dare approve and applaud themselves in such a state of impurity and defection. Do men think He is changed?...or do they suppose He minds these things no more? and, because He is unseen, that He seeth not?" [A most pertinent and weighty though difficult question. Good old Mr Simeon used to think the matter settled by the word of Paul "Let a man examine himself and so let him come." But can so great a transgression and disorder be let pass without the Master's censure? Ought not ministers and the "inspection," ἡ ἐπισκοπία, to apply to this case the monition uttered in another connexion, "neither be partaker of other mens' sins. *Keep thyself pure*"?]

(V.) FRANCIS TURRETIN, OF GENEVA. B. 1623. D. 1687.

Pastor, Doctor, and Professor. Was at Leyden three years. He also published several disputations on various theological subjects.

P. 488. "Of consecration. But we deny that consecration is to be assigned to one utterance making the true body in the sacrament, but we say that it is to be set in Christ's whole action on that occasion, and chiefly in the blessing, by which the elements are transferred from a common and natural use and are raised to a sacred and mystical use.

P. 499. "Those words 'This is My body' have no form of prayer, and ask for nothing, and are directed to the apostles and

Vol. III. 488.

*De consecratione.* Nos vero negamus consecrationem affigendam esse pronuntiationi verificæ sacramentali, sed constituendam esse in totâ actione Christi, et præcipue in benedictione, quâ elementa ab usu communi et naturali transvehuntur et evehuntur ad usum sacrum et mysticum.

P. 499.

Verba ista, Hoc est corpus Meum, nullam habent precationis formam, et nihil postulant, et ad apostolos non ad Deum diriguntur. Nec sunt



not to God. Nor are they the words of one asking and desiring or commanding that anything be done, which as yet is not, nor of one promising, but of one indicating and narrating the very thing referred to. Nor ought there to be a consecration of signs for a separate use otherwise than there is a consecration of food daily for common use, since on every side a consecration is given of things destined for man's uses, though it be in different degrees. No one can doubt that Christ wished by His prayers to seek for God's blessing on the signs, which it was necessary should be fit for the sacred use for which they were devoted. The particle 'for' is inserted in the canon of the mass, why the bread is to be received. The words are not enunciated in the imperative, as 'let there be light;' but it is indicative as 'In the beginning was the Word.'

P. 491. "Durandus in his fourth Book laid down that a priest has made Christ [in consecration] when his own life has been good. So others also say.

P. 532. "When the proper literal sense involves anything absurd and contradictory, we must of necessity fly to a figurative sense.

P. 533. "When the speaker's scope, the cause and occasion of the speech, the state and disposition of the audience, the place and time lead us of their own accord to a figure and to a trope.

poscentis et optantis, nec imperantis ut fiat aliquid quod nondum sit, nec promittentis, sed id ipsum de quo agitur indicantis et narrantis. ... Non aliter fieri debet consecratio symbolorum ad usum secretum, quam sit consecratio ciborum quotidie ad usum communem, siquidem utrobique datur consecratio rerum, quæ usibus humanis destinatæ sunt, licet in dispari gradu. Nemo dubitare potest quin precibus Suis (Christus) voluerit benedictionem Dei accersere in symbola, quæ necessaria erat ut essent apta ad sacrum usum, cui destinabantur. Particula "enim" inseritur in canone missæ, *cur* panis ille sumendus, &c. Non enunciantur verba in imperativo ut "Fiat lux," sed indicativo, ut "in principio erat Verbum."

P. 491.

Durandus Ration. Lib. iv. c. 41 statuit Christum tunc confecisse, cum bene vixit. Ita Cajetanus, Cassander et alii.

P. 532.

Quando proprietas literæ involvit aliquid absurdi et contradictorii, confugiendum est necessario ad sensum figurativum (a Regulis Sermonis).

P. 533.

Quando scopus loquentis, causa et occasio sermonis, status ac dispositio auditorum, locus et tempus, ad figuram et tropum sponte nos ducunt.

P. 553. "It is not the question what God can do, but what He wills to do. The power of God is not the rule of our faith, but His will, &c.

iv. 778. "Merit of congruity is a work done, that is morally good, out of free will, without any grace assisting. Merit of dignity (worthiness)...is a thing deemed worthy to earn eternal life. Merit of condignity is a good work done out of free will assisted by grace.

P. 570. "Although Christ (after His resurrection) was stripped of the infirmities of animal life and the conditions of the state of a bond-servant, He may have retained nevertheless both the nature of a true body and all its true properties. Christ could enter, when the doors had been shut...for although the doors had been shut, they could yield to the Creator, and be opened at His nod. He was made non-apparent, Luke xxiv., by withholding the disciples' eyes, that they should not see Him departing, that is to the disciples at Emmaus."

P. 553.

Non agitur de eo *quod Deus potest*, sed de eo *quod vult*. Potentia Dei non est regula fidei nostræ, sed Ejus voluntas, &c.

Vol. IV. p. 778.

Meritum congrui, opus moraliter bonum, factum ex libero arbitrio, nullâ adjuvante gratiâ. Meritum digni ... digna censetur ut mereatur vitam æternam. Meritum condigni, bonum opus factum ex libero arbitrio adjuto a gratiâ.

P. 570.

Licet Christus (post resurrectionem) exutus sit infirmitatibus vitæ animalis et servilis status conditionibus, retinuerit tamen et veri corporis naturam et omnes ejus proprietates. Christus potuit ingredi januis clausis ... licet enim januæ erant clausæ, potuerunt cedere Creatori, et aperiri ad Ejus nutum. Factus ἀφαντος, Luke xxiv., oculos apostolorum cohibendo, ne Se abeuntem videant, scilicet discipulis Emaunticis.

(W.) WILLIAM OUTRAM, D.D., ARCHDEACON OF LEICESTER.

B. 1625. D. 1679.

Studied at Trinity, Cambridge. He resigned his London living, St Mary Woolnoth, three years before he was appointed Archdeacon. A Prebend in Westminster Abbey was added to his honours, and he became Rector of St Margaret's. He is supposed to have written in Latin, because Socinus was better answered in the language

that he had used. Besides his greater work, whose translation by Allen is accepted, twenty of his sermons were published three years after his death.

*Two Dissertations on Sacrifices.* Latin, 1677. Allen, 1817.

P. 294. "The opinion entertained by some—that the sacrifices offered by Aaron were of a different kind from those offered by Melchizedek, &c., and that Melchizedek offered nothing but bread and wine, appears to me to have no foundation. Melchizedek gave bread and wine to Abraham and his servants on their return from a battle, in order to recruit their exhausted strength....Nor is Melchizedek called a priest because he brought forth bread and wine; but to account for his solemn benediction of Abraham, which was part of his priestly office, and also for Abraham's giving him a tenth of the spoils....There is no ground, therefore, for the supposition that Melchizedek sacrificed nothing but bread and wine, or none but inanimate things; but sufficient reason for a contrary opinion. For if his priesthood had nothing to do with a bloody sacrifice, how came it to pass that Christ Himself, whose priesthood is declared to be of the same kind as Melchizedek's, offered His sacrifice by shedding His own blood? Nor should we pay any attention to those who attribute to Christ a priesthood of the order of Aaron as well as that of Melchizedek, and suppose that He offered a sacrifice by blood in the character of an Aaronic priest: Heb. vii. 11, 'not after the order of Aaron.'

P. 296. "To constitute a priest absolutely perfect, &c. First he must have sufficient authority and favour with God to be able effectually to commend his people to Him and to render Him propitious to them. (2) Kindness and mercy towards men, &c., and (3) he must possess an immortal life to be capable of the perpetual performance.

P. 328. "To say that Christ bare away the sin of many unless He bare it away by sustaining the punishment of it conveys no idea of His sufferings. Is. liii. 4, 1 Pet. ii. 24.

P. 338. "He clearly suffered a vicarious punishment.

P. 134. "Eucharistic sacrifices [*i.e.* of thanksgiving] under the law; [p. 214] always with bread, Lev. vii. 12, 13.

P. 365. "As our High-priest now executes this office [Mediator] so He began to execute it when He first appeared in His presence in the Heavenly sanctuary, *i.e.* at the moment when He offered Himself to God.

P. 364. "These two phrases, to appear in the presence of God, and to offer Himself (to God), signifying one and the same thing. [To this a demurrer may be entered, *viz.*, that He never offered

Himself to God in Heaven, but only on earth on the cross; and therefore the two expressions are of separate and different senses.]

P. 375. "Seeing then that Christ in interceding with God for us performs the office of our Patron and Advocate, &c. that He offered Himself as a piacular victim previously slain for our sins; and that this oblation differs not in fact from that intercession, &c., &c.

[Though Dr Outram or Owtram does not deal directly with our subject, his remarks on Melchizedek seem to be of the greatest service; but not his assumption that Jesus after His ascension has to offer Himself to the Father in Heaven before His one offering of Himself is truly and fully accepted. In fact Outram seems to me half inclined to surrender that idea, and rightly to merge all Christ's work in Heaven in His interceding and reigning. See Heb. x. 12.]

*Treatise of the Holy Communion under both heads.*  
London, 1687.

Chap. I. p. 2. "It was never so much as dreamt of, that the grace annexed to the sacred body of the Lord was any way distinct from that which belonged to the blood. He gave His body before He gave His blood; and we may conclude from the words of S. Luke and S. Paul that He gave His body when at supper, and His blood after: so that there was a considerable interval between the two actions. Did He suspend the grace or spiritual effects of His body? or, when they received His body, did they receive the grace which is annexed to it, *viz.* that of being incorporated into Jesus Christ and nourished with His substance? Without doubt they did....The substance is entirely contained under one kind; and each kind by itself, and both together contain the same source or fountain of grace and sanctification.

[This reasoning seems quite unanswerable by any one who believes in the actual natural body of Christ being given to the communicant. But such as hold that both are suggestive symbols, and that there is no receiving of anything beyond spiritual grace as coming direct from God, are in no difficulty. Bossuet puts "body and blood," where we in such an instance put "bread and wine."]

P. 9. "'Tis not so in the language of the church, that the mentioning of the body only, includes the body and blood; on the contrary you will find among the fathers that in all passages that mention the distribution of His body and blood they are both clearly expressed, &c.

P. 8. "The famous George Calixtus, the most considerable of our Lutherans, and the learnedst adversary we have, &c.

P. 9. "I never met with any place that mentions the distribution of the body and blood without naming both.... 'Twas as easy for Calixtus to find an instance as myself; and that there is no such instance to be found is evident in that it hath escaped the eye of so subtil and so industrious an adversary.

[I wholly receive this; but what becomes of the assertion of those Romanist writers and some Protestants also who maintain that our Lord celebrated the Lord's supper at Emmaus and St Paul on shipboard, and in other cases where it is only said that they broke bread, and not that they broke bread and drank wine?]

P. 77. "Jesus Christ instituted this blessed sacrament in the evening, in the beginning of the night in which He was to be betrayed ... The consecrating it at that very hour might raise a more lively image of His passion, and altogether might represent that Jesus Christ was to die [at] the last hour, that is in the last period of times. Yet none believes these words oblige us to an hour so full of mysteries.

"*By the law of the holy church* we are to take that, fasting, which Jesus Christ gave after supper."

(X.) JAMES BENIGNE BOSSUET, BISHOP OF MEAUX.

B. 1637. D. 1704.

No one that is even sparingly acquainted with the life of this extraordinary man can hesitate to deem him worthy of considerable admiration, until the time came when he fell into the damaging conflict with Fenelon. It would seem that something in that struggle made the worst part of his character come uppermost, and almost turned the eagle of Meaux into a vulture. For not only does he without sparing do his utmost to rend and devour, which we might say is after the nature of an eagle, but he gives himself without reserve to sanction and carry out all the dirty back-stairs work, whereby his nephew, the Abbé, who was certainly vulture and not eagle, succeeded at last in wringing a condemnation of the good Archbishop of Cambray from the reluctant Head of the Roman communion. Whether there was in Bossuet some latent jealousy of the Archbishop's higher title, combined with some personal envy of his superior address and unbroken sweetness of demeanour, and some internal conviction of the inferiority of Fenelon's intellectual powers to his own, must be left to conjecture; but surely no lover of clerical or Christian excellence can

fail to feel something like a personal humiliation in the moral overthrow of the victor in this long contest. It is true that the extraordinary Christian meekness and self-sacrifice which were displayed by Fenelon in his reception of his defeat will ever stand as an example of the meaning of that true Christian *ἐπιεικεία*, which everyone accounts as much above "moderation." We may indeed hardly be able to go quite as far as Fenelon in the surrender of private judgment to church authority; but to suffer all that Fenelon suffered without any appearance of anger or of desire for revenge, has left the Archbishop of Cambray encircled with a glory which Protestants will be the better for admiring. But to turn to all the earlier part of Bossuet's history, whether we look to his unremitting and indeed excessive labour, defrauding body and mind of appointed nightly repose, or to his faithful remonstrances up to a certain point with his licentious king, or to his fearless and successful defence of the Gallican liberties, in which he trampled on the power of the Roman curia, or to his affability towards any and every applicant for episcopal counsel, we may well think that he merits his high reputation. I confess that I should not say the same of his reasoning powers. His judgments seem to me struck off at too high a temperature, and evolved with too great facility. His eleven large volumes, in Migne's double-columned edition, testify to the quantity of his remains. Had he written less and given more thought to the possibility of there being arguments on the other side of the great questions that he has handled, he would have left less room for such powerful replies as those of Archdeacon Hare in his earnest defence of Luther. His readiness to enter into open controversial debate with M. Claude and with M. Paul Ferry, is also greatly to his honour; but the main subject in both of those discussions is not the subject of this present work but only bears on it: for it is the authority of the Roman Catholic ministry and the consequent greater possibility of salvation in that communion. But besides these merits, his earnest desire to amend the morals, and to give a sound education to the French clergy deserves all praise; and all the more, because he was himself a pattern for Christian morality as well as for theological learning. The chief utterance of his opinion on the Lord's supper is given as much at full as our limits allow: but there is not room for extracts from his Variations of Protestantism, which are in everyone's hands in an English trans-

lation. And yet I must not omit to say that this English does not embrace much more than half of what Bossuet has written on this subject. So unsafe is it ever to rest in anything short of the full original writings. One marvels at the arguments which satisfy him about communion in one kind, when one considers the late date at which he wrote : but his efforts to bring about a union with German Protestants, even if they be regarded as the work of a visionary, may be adduced as triumphantly rescuing him from another charge, that would be as much to his disparagement, viz. that blind devotion to party, which stands condemned under the branding name of bigotry.

P. 1149. "*Dogmatic Theology. Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholic church. The Doctrine of the church concerning the Real Presence of the Body and the Blood of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist.* The real presence of our Lord's body and blood in this sacrament is established on a solid foundation by the words of the institution, which we understand to the very letter : and we must not any more ask why we attach ourselves to the proper literal sense, than we ask a traveller why he follows the high road. [Surely this is particularly unfair, as being pure assumption of the literal sense in this case.] This question may be put to those that have recourse to figurative senses, and who take devious by-paths to give a reason for what they do. On our part as we find nothing in the words that Jesus Christ uses to institute this mystery [never so called in the New Testament], which obliges us to take them in a figurative sense, we deem this reason sufficient to make us settle their interpretation in the natural sense [*i.e.* the whole force of analogy, which is induction from the numerous instances of figurative language used by Jesus and by others in the Scripture, particularly in what we call the East, goes for

---

*Œuvres de Bossuet.* 11 tom. Migne. Paris, 1866. T. I. P. 1149.

*Théologie Dogmatique. Exposition de la Doctrine de l'Eglise Catholique. Doctrine de l'Eglise touchant la Présence Réelle du corps et du Sang de Jésus Christ dans l'Eucharistie.* La présence réelle du corps et du sang de notre Seigneur dans ce sacrement est solidement établie par les paroles de l'institution, lesquelles nous entendons à la lettre : et il ne nous faut non plus demander pourquoi nous nous attachons au sens propre et littéral, qu'à un voyageur pourquoi il suit le grand chemin. C'est à eux qui ont recours aux sens figurés et qui prennent des sentiers détournés à rendre raison de ce qu'ils font. Pour nous, qui ne trouvons rien dans les paroles dont Jésus Christ se sert pour l'institution de ce mystère qui nous oblige à les prendre en un sens figuré, nous estimons que cette raison suffit pour nous déterminer en sens propre.

nothing with M. Bossuet. This cannot impress any with favour towards him as a candid man or a trustworthy reasoner.] But we are the more strongly bound to it when we come to consider in this mystery the intention of the Son of God, which I will explain as simply as I can, and on the principles which I think our adversaries will not refuse to accept. [This is followed by another pure assumption.] I read then that the words of our Lord (Matt. xxvi. and Luke xxii.) 'Take, eat, this is My body given for you,' put plainly before our eyes that, as the ancient Jews did not unite themselves only in spirit to the sacrificing of the victims that were offered for them, but that in effect they ate the sacrificed flesh, which thing was to them a mark of the part which they had in the offering; so Jesus Christ, being Himself our victim, has willed that we should effectively eat the flesh of this Sacrifice, in order that the actual communication of this adorable flesh may be a perpetual testimony to each of us in particular, that it is for us that He has taken it, and that it is for us that He was slain. [Had Bossuet asserted that there is some *a priori* probability in favour of this argument, he would have, I think, put upon it the very utmost strain that logic can allow. In two paragraphs more about the Jews not eating sin offering, and not drinking the blood, he more fully draws the inference.]

P. 1150. "Thus the eating of the flesh and blood is as real at the holy table as the grace of the expiation of sins and the participation of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ is actual and effective in the new covenant. [He then accounts for the remaining of accidents of the bread and wine as many have done, and then he

---

Mais nous sommes y encore plus fortement engagés, quand nous venons à considérer dans ce mystère l'intention du Fils de Dieu, que j'expliquerai le plus simplement qu'il me sera possible, et par des principes dont je crois que nos adversaires ne pourront disconvenir. Je lis donc que les paroles du Sauveur (Matt. xxvi. et Luc xxii.) "Prenez, mangez, "ceci est Mon corps donné pour vous," nous font voir que comme les anciens Juifs ne s'unissaient pas seulement en esprit à l'immolation des victimes qui étaient offertes pour eux; mais qu'en effet ils mangeaient la chair sacrifiée, ce qui leur était une marque de la part qu'ils avaient de cette oblation; ainsi Jésus Christ S'étant fait Lui-même notre Victime, a voulu que nous mangeassions effectivement la chair de cette Sacrifice, afin que la communication actuelle de cette chair adorable fût un témoignage perpétuel à chacun de nous en particulier, que c'est pour nous qu'Il l'a prise et que c'est pour nous qu'Il l'a immolée.

P. 1150.

Ainsi la manducation de la chair et du sang du Fils de Dieu est aussi réelle à la sainte table que la grâce de l'expiation des péchés et la participation au sacrifice de Jésus Christ est actuelle et effective dans



sums up.] It appears then that to accomplish these ancient figures, and to put us in actual possession of the Victim offered for our sin, Jesus Christ designed to give us His body and His blood in truth ; which is so evident that our adversaries themselves wish us to believe that they are of the same opinion as we, since they cease not to repeat to us that they deny neither the truth nor the real participation of the body and the blood in the eucharist. [It is then surely high time that all that call themselves Protestants should deny that there is any real presence of Christ's flesh and blood on earth now, so that they may not be said to hold the same opinion as M. Bossuet.]...In effect, if the Son of God, [ordinarily] so studious to explain to His Apostles what He teaches under parables and figures, not having said aught here to explain Himself [this must be taken as a pendent nominative, if the sentence be not incomplete], it follows that He leaves His words in their natural sense.

P. 1151. "These laws of language teach us that the sign, which is the actual representation to us, often receives the name of the thing (represented), since it is natural to it to bring its idea to the mind. The same also takes place, though within certain limits, respecting the signs of institutions when they are received [but in his view the signs are not in substance received, but only their accidents: for in his view it is the real things signified that in substance are received], and when one is accustomed to them there. But in establishing a sign, which of itself has no (near) relation to the thing (signified)—for instance a piece of bread to signify a man's body—one gives it the name of the other without explaining, and before any agreement on the subject, as Jesus Christ has

---

la nouvelle alliance. Il paraît donc que pour accomplir les figures anciennes et nous mettre en possession actuelle de la Victime offerte pour notre péché Jésus Christ a eu dessein de nous donner en vérité Son corps et Son sang : ce qui est si évident, que nos adversaires mêmes veulent que nous croyons qu'ils ont en cela le même sentiment que nous, puisqu'ils ne cessent de nous répéter qu'ils nient ni la vérité ni la participation réelle du corps et du sang dans l'eucharistie... En effet si le Fils de Dieu, si soigneux d'exposer à Ses apôtres ce qu'Il enseigne sous des paraboles et sous des figures, n'ayant rien dit ici pour S'expliquer, il paraît qu'Il laisse Ses paroles dans leur signification naturelle.

P. 1151.

Ces lois de discours nous apprennent que le signe, qui nous représente actuellement, reçoit souvent le nom de la chose, parce qu'il lui est comme naturel d'en ramener l'idée à l'esprit. Le même arrive aussi, quoique avec certaines limites, aux signes d'institutions, quand ils sont reçus et quand on y est accoutumé. Mais qu'en établissant un signe, qui de soi n'a aucun rapport à la chose—par exemple un morceau de pain pour signifier le corps d'un homme—on lui en donne le nom sans rien

done in the supper ; it is a thing unheard of, and of which we see not a single example in all Holy Scripture, not to say in all the utterances of mankind. [In the first place M. Bossuet here stoops to argue why the literal sense of language of Christ ought to be admitted, and thus opens the door to free discussion. Secondly he lays down a canon which every man's everyday experience contradicts in most of the cases when he uses figures. As has been urged a hundred times, A lamb is not a passing over, A cup is not the New Testament, That rock was not Christ. But in such plain cases it is not usual to stop to explain.]

P. 1151. "Explanation of the words 'Do this in remembrance of Me.' Must Christians on the pretext of celebrating in the supper the remembrance of the passion of our Lord take away from this pious commemoration whatever it has that is most efficacious and most tender? Ought they not to consider that Jesus Christ does not simply command them to remember Him, but to remember Him in eating His flesh and drinking His blood? What in effect is there with more power in it for us to do in remembering Him? And if children so tenderly remember their father and his excellencies when they draw near to the tomb where his body is shut up, how much ought our remembrance and our love to be excited when we hold under the consecrated coverings, under this mystic tomb, the proper flesh of our Saviour sacrificed for us, this living and vivifying flesh and this blood yet all warm by His love and all full of spirit and grace? [It must at least be said that Bishop Bossuet writes his own remarkable tongue with singular simplicity and beauty and very adroitly urges his pleas.]

---

expliquer, et avant que personne en soit convenu, comme a fait Jésus Christ dans la cène : c'est une chose inouïe et dont nous ne voyons aucun exemple dans toute l'Ecriture Sainte, pour ne pas dire, dans tout le langage humain.

*XI. P. 1151.*

Explication des paroles, "Faites ceci en mémoire de Moi." Faut-il que les Chrétiens, sous prétexte de célébrer dans la cène la mémoire de la passion de notre Seigneur, ôtent à cette pieuse commemoration ce qu'elle a de plus efficace et de plus tendre? Ne doivent ils pas considérer que Jésus Christ ne commande pas simplement qu'on se souvienne de Lui, mais qu'on souvienne en mangeant Sa chair et Son sang?... Qu'y a-t-il en effet de plus puissant pour nous faire en souvenir? Et si les enfants se souviennent si tendrement de leur père et de ses bontés lorsqu'ils approchent du tombeau où son corps est enfermé, combien notre souvenir et notre amour doivent-ils être excités, lorsque nous tenons sous ces enveloppes sacrées, sous ce tombeau mystique, la propre chair de notre Sauveur immolé pour nous, cette chair vivante et vivifiante, et ce sang encore tout chaud par Son amour et tout plein d'esprit et de grâce?

P. 1159. *The Sacrifice of the Mass.* "The Son of God is put on the holy table, in virtue of (the utterance of) these words, clothed with the signs that represent His death. We believe that Jesus Christ, present on the holy table in this figure of His death, intercedes for us and continually represents before His Father the death which He has suffered for His church. It is in this sense that we say that Jesus Christ offers Himself to God for us in the eucharist; it is in this manner that we think that this oblation causes God to become more propitious, and this is why we call (this sacrament) propitiatory. Such is the sacrifice of Christians, infinitely different from what was practised under the law—a sacrifice spiritual and worthy of the new covenant, in which the Victim presented is not perceived but by faith, in which the sword is the word that mystically separates the body and the blood [a turn of speech more rhetorical than logical]...a sacrifice nevertheless very true, in that Jesus Christ is truly contained and presented to God under the figure of His death; but a sacrifice of commemoration, as it, very far from disconnecting us from the Sacrifice of the cross, according to the objection which some make to it, connects us to it by all its details.

P. 1160. "Catholics pretend not to make a new propitiation to appease God afresh, as if He were not sufficiently appeased by the sacrifice of the cross, or to add any supplement to the price of our salvation, as if it were imperfect. [It is evident that M. Bossuet

XIV. *Le Sacrifice de la Messe.* P. 1159.

Le Fils de Dieu est mis sur la sainte table, en vertu de ces paroles, revêtu des signes qui représentent Sa mort. Nous croyons que Jésus Christ, présent sur la sainte table en cette figure de mort, intercède pour nous et représente continuellement à Son Père la mort qu'Il a soufferte pour Son église. C'est en ce sens que nous disons que Jésus Christ S'offre à Dieu pour nous dans l'eucharistie; c'est en cette manière que nous pensons que cette oblation fait que nous Dieu devient plus propice, et c'est pourquoi nous l'appelons propitiatoire... Tel est le sacrifice des Chrétiens, infiniment différent de celui qui se pratiquait dans la loi—sacrifice spirituel et digne de la nouvelle alliance, où la Victime présentée n'est pas aperçue que par la foi, où le glaive est la parole qui sépare mystiquement le corps et le sang... sacrifice néanmoins très véritable en ce que Jésus Christ est véritablement contenu et présenté à Dieu sous cette figure de mort: mais sacrifice de commemoration, qui bien loin de nous détacher, comme on nous l'objecte, du sacrifice de la croix, nous y attache par toutes ses circonstances.

P. 1160.

Les catholiques ne prétendent pas de faire une nouvelle propitiation pour apaiser Dieu de nouveau, comme s'Il ne l'était pas suffisamment par le sacrifice de la croix, ou pour ajouter quelque supplément au prix de notre salut, comme s'il était imparfait.

comes down considerably in this part from the general representation of the priest actually offering up Christ to God as a sacrifice, or as is often said exhibiting a bona fide *θυσία* or *slain sacrifice* on the altar, and thus repeating the sacrifice once made on the cross. But the one standing difference between the Reformed faith and his own should ever be the denial of the bodily presence of Christ in the Lord's supper. The Lutheran, as Bossuet boasts, granted that, and so opened to Bossuet the path to victory. To deny that, which is but an arbitrary assumption, and to make a strong case against it, is the very stronghold of Protestantism. It is open to questioning, and may fairly be discussed in an open arena. It has been again and again thus contended for, and we really think that, when fairly stated, it has always been shewn to have a large balance of probability on its side.]

P. 1158. "Such is this word's force, that it prevents our ascribing these external appearances to the substance of bread, and makes us ascribe them to the present body of Jesus Christ; so that as the presence of so adorable an object is certified to us by this sign, we hesitate not to bring to it our adoration. [Yet the body of Jesus in itself, apart from the Godhead, is not a proper object of worship.]

P. 273. *Ascetic Theology. Meditation on the Gospel. Jan. 25.* "Let us learn that the eucharist is a remedy from sin. If we purge ourselves from the great it will efface the small, and give us force to escape both small and great sins.

P. 192. *Instruction for the Dauphin for his First Communion.* "With the body one receives the blood, and with the blood one receives the body; and one receives with one and the other the

P. 1158.

Telle est la force de cette parole, qu'elle empêche que nous ne rapportions à la substance du pain ces apparences extérieures, et nous les fait rapporter au corps de Jésus Christ présent; de sorte que, la présence d'un objet si adorable nous étant certifiée par ce signe, nous n'hésitons pas à y porter nos adorations.

Tom. III. *Théol. ascétique, II. Méditat. sur l'Evangile. Jan. 25.*  
P. 273.

Apprenons que l'eucharistie est un remède des péchés. Si nous nous purgeons des grands, elle effacera les petits, et nous donnera de la force à éviter et les petits et les grands.

Tom. VIII. *Instruction à M. le Dauphin pour sa Première Communion. P. 192.*

Avec le corps on reçoit le sang: et avec le sang on reçoit le corps:

soul and the Divinity of Jesus Christ, which cannot be separated : that is to say, one receives Jesus Christ entire, both God and man, all together. He that Himself gives Himself cannot any more refuse us anything."

P. 219. *A Treatise on the Communion in the two kinds.* P. 321. *Under one kind.*

It may be interesting to add two short extracts from the Commentary of Madame Guion. "1 Cor. xi. 24, Take, eat, &c. This passage of St Paul, after having related the words of the supper, is yet further a proof of the reality of the body and of the blood of Christ in the eucharist; for if it be nothing but bread, how is it possible to be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord? One is only guilty of that which is there [a false premiss]. If I eat bread unworthily, I am only guilty of having profaned a figurative mystery [that is something]. But if I eat the body of Jesus Christ unworthily, I am guilty of an impious action against this body. [Undoubtedly. This pious court-lady may be only guilty of only seeing the subject from her own point of view, but at least writing like this could not displease her assailants. In fact she writes much like a disciple of Bossuet, adopting his very phrases.]

"1 Cor. x. 21, 'He that eats and drinks unworthily, &c.' These words ought to cause to tremble not only bad [lay] Christians, but all the priests of criminal life that celebrate it in a sinful condition.... They will have to give account of their people whom they have made sin, either through their bad example or through easy

et on reçoit avec l'un et l'autre l'âme et la Divinité de Jésus Christ, qui ne peuvent en être séparés; c'est à dire qu'on reçoit Jésus Christ entier, Dieu et homme tout ensemble.... Qui Se donne Soi-même ne peut plus rien refuser. See Tom. IX. p. 219. *Traité de la Communion sous les deux espèces.* P. 321, *sous une espèce.*

Tom. V. *Commentaire de Jeanne Marie Bouvier de la Mothe, Mme Guion.* 20 tomes. Cologne, 1713.

1 Cor. xi. 24, "Prenez, mangez, &c." Ce passage de S. Paul, après avoir rapporté les paroles de la cène, est encore une preuve de la réalité du corps et du sang de Jésus Christ dans l'eucharistie; car, si ce n'est que du pain, comment être "coupable du corps et du sang du Seigneur"? On est coupable de ce qui y est: si je mange du pain indignement, je ne suis pas coupable que d'avoir profané une figure mystérieuse: mais si je mange le corps de Jésus Christ indignement, je suis coupable d'impiété contre ce même corps.

1 Cor. x. 21... "Celui qui boit et mange indignement, &c." Ces paroles les devraient faire trembler non seulement les mauvais Chrétiens; mais tant de prêtres criminels qui célèbrent en méchant état... ils rendront compte des peuples qu'ils ont fait pécher, ou par le mauvais

courtesy....There are some confessors that are so far from destroying sin, that they promote the very sins in the process of confessions.

"Ps. xxiii. 5, 'Thou preparest a table, &c.' The festival that God has prepared for us is no other than the very holy eucharist, which is the true support under all afflictions, miseries and temptations; and those that have experienced these trials ought as often as they can to approach this Divine table. The devil's most dangerous temptation is to draw Christians into withdrawing from the communion during these temptations under the pretext of being unworthy of it, because he sees that this is the way to ruin them; and that, if they be nourished by this very substantial food, they could not fail nor be weakened. [A strong assertion.] Should this be a reason for depriving a person of nourishment because he is weak, and for saying that he must wait till he is become strong before he is nourished? He will never make himself strong: on the contrary, he will get weaker till he dies. O God, Thy table is prepared for all mankind, but especially for those that are tried and afflicted. I conjure directors not to keep them back from the communion when they are in this state, and not to listen to their scrupulous fears and doubts: for if they had sinned [so greatly] they would not have so much dread of evil, so much fear of displeasing God, or so much sorrow; and even when the excess of the temptation may have made them fall into some sin of infirmity, contrary to their desire, it is then that they have most

---

exemple ou par une lâche complaisance.... Il y a des confesseurs qui tolèrent et fomentent même le péché dans les confessionaux, loin de le détruire.

Ps. xxiii. 5. Le festin que Dieu nous a préparé, &c. n'est autre que la très sainte eucharistie, qui est le véritable soutien dans toutes les afflictions, dans les misères, et dans les tentations; et ceux qui en sont éprouvés doivent s'approcher le plus qu'ils pourront de cette Divine table. La plus dangereuse tentation du démon est de porter les Chrétiens à se retirer de la communion dans les tentations, sous prétexte qu'ils en sont indignes, parcequ'il voit bien que c'est le moyen de les perdre; et que s'ils sont nourris de cette viande si substantielle, ils ne pourront tomber ni être affoiblis. Serait ce une raison de retrancher la nourriture à une personne parce qu'elle est faible, et de dire qu'il faut attendre à la nourrir qu'elle soit devenue forte? Elle ne se fortifiera jamais. Au contraire elle s'affoiblira, jusqu'à ce qu'elle meure. O Dieu votre table est préparée pour tous les hommes, mais singulièrement pour ceux qui sont tentés et affligés. Les directeurs sont conjurés de ne les point retirer de la communion, lorsqu'ils sont dans cet état, et de ne point écouter leurs craintes, leurs scrupules et leurs doutes, car s'ils avoient péché, ils n'auroient tant d'horreur du mal, tant de crainte de déplaire à Dieu, ni de si grands douleurs; et quand même l'excès de la tentation les auroit fait tomber en quelque foiblesse, n'étant pas

need of being nourished, and the pain that they suffer is a great remedy to their evils. In God's name let them force these sick ones, these blind, these lame, to enter into the feast, for such is the purpose of the Father of the family."

This passage is a kindred supplement to a choice address of Theodoret, which was cited in its place and was referred to as singularly congruous with the spirit of the appeals of the Church of England addresses on this subject. Madame Guion's commentary on Proverbs ix. brings out some of the peculiar wording which grew around her system, whose aim certainly was to explain and promote entire devotion of heart to God through Christ.

Some allusion ought perhaps to be made to Professor Upham's Life of Madame Guion, a work, which no one can read without being struck and attracted by the pictures of exquisite and almost perfect faith and piety which it presents in the persons of Archbishop Fenelon and Madame Guion. To see what the latter had to suffer for simply promoting religion of the heart by faith, which is what she means by the term, Sanctification by Faith, seems to make us ashamed that we have so little opposition and evil-speaking to bear for Christ's sake.

volontaire, c'est alors qu'ils ont plus de besoin d'être nourris; et la douleur qu'ils en souffrent est un grand remède à leurs maux. Au nom de Dieu que l'on force ces malades, ces aveugles ces boiteux d'entrer dans le festin; car c'est l'intention du Pere de la famille.

(Y.) JOHN CLAUDE, MINISTER AND MEMBER OF THE CONSISTORY OF CHARENTON. B. 1619. D. 1687.

One would almost believe that this learned and unbending controversialist is a lineal descendant of Claudius (Claude) who was first made Bishop of Avranches, and afterwards planted by Louis le Debonair, son of Charlemagne, at Turin, to check the worship of images and of the cross and of relics of saints on the French side of Italy. This work of Bishop Claude of Turin, we have seen carried on at Lyons with somewhat less of determination by Agobard, the man of science, who was so far in advance of his age. The same staunch immobility and utter fearlessness

which were displayed by Claude of Turin, who died in 839, stand forth in this noted Huguenot Pastor who defended Albertinus (Aubertin) from the powerful assault of the great Antoine Arnauld in his *Perpétuité de la Foi*, and had to contend with Bossuet himself. It was one of the features of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes by which Louis XIV. inflicted exile on all Protestants, that this minister of Charenton received orders to quit Paris in 24 hours. Such was the pitch of Jesuit hatred and perhaps of fear towards the man who could enter the lists with Bossuet, and be deemed by his own side the victor in the great struggle. None can doubt his learning, or dispute the conciseness and directness of his reasoning. It is therefore little to the credit of the Jesuits of that age that they exiled Antoine Arnauld as well as M. Claude. The former, as we have seen, retired to Belgium, and this sufferer went to Holland. It is no wonder that M. Claude in his two years' exile published "The lamentations (plaintes) of the cruelly "oppressed Protestants of France." He, as well as M. Arnauld, had been a leading spirit of the Sorbonne, which may well be proud of such children. But M. Claude's work on the eucharist is of the personal character that defies abridgement. It is only possible to insert a few samples of his doctrine and reasoning. He laboured as a Christian minister at Montauban and Nismes before he was called to take the place of M. Aubertin at Charenton in the suburbs of the capital; a position, which installed him in the dignity of president of the reformed religion in France. There are not two opinions about his having been the head of what was then (somewhat unhappily for our subject) entitled the Calvinist party in France.

*The Catholic Doctrine of the Eucharist in all ages.* B. III. c. 2.  
London, 1686.

P. 114. On "the Greeks refusing to use the term transubstantiation." "This Arcudius himself is forced to confess in the same place, where he would persuade us that the Greeks believe in the conversion of substances; 'In the sacrament of the eucharist,' says he, 'the Greeks acknowledge, embrace and believe 'with a firm faith, veram μετουσίωσιν, a real transubstantiation, 'as it appears by the testimony of the Greek fathers of all ages, 'and lately by that of Jeremias the patriarch of Constantinople 'in the tenth chapter of his censure on the Lutherans...and although they use not this term, yet have they invented others



'by which they explain themselves as fully as can be desired. 'Dicunt enim μεταβάλλεσθαι καὶ μεταβολὴν, μεταποιεῖσθαι καὶ 'μεταποίησιν, καὶ μετάβασιν, μεταρρυθμίζειν, μετασκευάζειν, μετα-  
'στοιχειοῦν, τελειῶσιν et τελειοῦν, μετέναξιν, aliaque, id genus.'

P. 115. "M. Arnaud, who has made an exact search by himself and his friends, cannot produce one passage that bears this expression; which in my judgment is an evident token that it is not in them. We may see likewise the books of the most approved authors, as of John Damascene, Nicephorus, the patriarch of Constantinople, Photius, Theophylact, Ecumenius, Zonaras, Germain, Balsamon, Nicetas Choniates, Cabirilas, Mark of Ephesus, Jeremias the Patriarch, Metrophanus, and as many others whose works are extant, in which we find no such expression as answers that of transubstantiation....And M. Arnaud himself has been forced to acknowledge that this word *μετουσίωσις* is not that which the Greeks ordinarily use, whereby to explain transubstantiation.

"The Latins, who have not in common use either the term substantiatio or substantiare, have invented or admitted of that of transubstantiatio and transubstantiare as most proper to express their conception on that subject; so that this consideration, that we find not this kind of expressions in the writings of the Greeks, is a kind of proof that they believe not the thing signified by them, &c. &c.

P. 117. After quoting the Lateran decree, which defined the doctrine and gave the name in 1215, M. Claude proceeds, "But it is otherwise with the Greeks: for besides what I said, that they use not the term *μετουσίωσις* but reject it, it will not be found that they use any expressions which come near them of the church of Rome, or mention anything relating to a substantial conversion, or presence of substance under the accidents of bread and wine, or change of one substance into another, which is what ought to be said to shew that they believed in transubstantiation...We see not anything of this kind appear in the canons of their councils, confessions of faith or liturgies, books of devotions or any of their writings, whether published by their modern or ancient divines: and certainly it is very strange these people should believe in transubstantiation, and yet at the same time not so much as declare in express terms this their belief." [Cyril Lucar and others use it.]

I have let M. Claude enjoy sufficient space; but it may well be suggested that all this adroit and fine argumentation really turns on the absence of this one term among the Greeks; who nevertheless hold I think every other but this one, which in

Cent. XIII. was invented to express the real presence of Christ's body in or under the visible symbols.

It would I confess be more pleasant to me as a controversialist, who loves unity and peace whenever they can be had without a sacrifice of truth, to have seen M. Claude and M. Arnauld united in the effort to discover how far they were really in accord, instead of this toilsome struggle on the part of M. Claude to make the difference between them appear as great as possible. Time taught them that they had common enemies, who reckoned little of their differences of opinion, and who saw in both of them advocates of that spiritual and Augustinian truth to which the Jesuits were irreconcilably opposed, and which they had already trampled down in the cases of Jansenius, and Duvergier d'Hauranne, and all other devout and enlightened Port Royalists. The acumen and the immeasurable mastery small of facts possessed by M. Claude are precious aids towards reaching sound conclusions; but necessary in quite an equal degree are a yearning desire of agreement, and a loving wish to make the most of what is true or near to truth in another.

(Z.) EDWARD STILLINGFLEET, BISHOP OF WORCESTER.

B. 1635. D. 1689.

It is common to hear persons say "I prefer South to Stillingfleet by far:" which seems to be just a particular instance of the general saying, "I like the dashing dicta of a powerful orator above all the irresistible proofs by which a clear reasoner quietly builds up the high fabric of truth." It must be allowed that this author does not always cling to the calm path of clear reasoning, but not unfrequently lets his energy find vent in strong language of a lower type. But otherwise, to adopt his own expression, he is eminently "a man that understands himself," one that unscrupulous defendants of a false cause may well fear. His portrait confirms this idea. His face seems to give the idea of considerable power and complete self-possession. His great point, viz. that Christ's body is not present in the Lord's supper after the manner of spirit, is wisely taken up by Dean Goode as an irresistible negative conclusion, to the confusion of Bellarmine's arguments to the contrary. Would that none of such reasoners as Stillingfleet had

ever held the affirmative that there is some kind of bodily presence of Christ in the Lord's supper. If there is any bodily presence of Christ in that sacrament, that body is in innumerable places on earth at once as well as in Heaven at God's right hand: and all the strange conclusions that follow upon ubiquity, follow equally upon its multipresence. And yet often this author shews that he believes that Christ's body is in Heaven and not on earth. See the remarks on Dean Goode's book against the Archdeacons Denison and Wilberforce in the nineteenth century. O for the day when what such lay minds as Hallam and Coleridge saw to be the only alternative, might generally approve itself to the great band of thinking clergy, *viz.* either the approval of the bonâ-fide presence of the body in the supper as a body, or the denial of any bodily presence of Christ in it at all. On the latter side of the alternative there are only present the grace of Christ, the reception which the term "eating His body" figuratively describes, and the presence of the Godhead of Christ, which, if we may so speak, touches and is united with His body and human mind in Heaven, and also touches our souls and bodies on earth. But it seems as unreasonable to argue from this quasi-contact of Christ's Deity with His body in Heaven and our bodies on earth, that His body and ours touch one another on earth, as it would be to affirm that because a man touches the earth in England and another touches it in New Zealand, the two men touch one another and are in the same place. One might then also affirm that the north and south poles touch one another, and that the north pole is present with the south pole at the south, and that the south pole is present with the north pole at the north. Those that wish to dispute this reasoning can only do it by making Christ's limited human body coextensive, wherever the Lord's supper is rightly celebrated, with His Godhead, Which is in every such place because It is everywhere. To assert a presence of power and efficacy only is to deny a bodily presence.

This bishop sprang from the Stillingfleets of Stillingfleet, which is five miles from York. His grandfather's brother was Abbot of York. But the bishop was born at Cranborne in Dorsetshire. He went to St John's, Cambridge, in 1648. All his preferments were in London except his first, Sutton Vicarage in Bedfordshire, and his last, his bishopric. His life is part of the history of the Church of England.

*Note.* It is incumbent on me to assert that the reasonings, in this life, respecting the impossibility of a small limited substance such as a human body becoming so extended as to be present in a multitude of places at once all over Christendom, are not, as Leibnitz put it, simply a question of the extensibility of matter in the abstract without limit; which I suppose no one would venture to deny. For it is about matter in the form of a living human body, whose enormous asserted multipresence we are bold to deny. For the miracle is not that an infinitesimally small portion is present in such, but that in each place is a whole and entire body, totus integerque Christus; and that not, as the Franciscan said, by the evocation of so many entire bodies, but as the Dominicans maintained, by miraculously making one and the same entire body present everywhere, in which supposition it ceases to be a human body. That is to say, a human body in Heaven may be united to the Deity there, but it cannot be united to the Deity anywhere else too without ceasing to be a true-living human body. Some have vainly tried to escape the difficulty by asserting that it is Christ's dead body that is given; but His body is alive for ever.

*Grounds of Protestant Religion against T. C.* Vol. IV. Pt. III. c. 3.  
London, 1709.

P. 531. "The first in the indictment,' as you say, 'is that of the priest's intention defined by the councils of Florence and Trent (both of them confirmed by the pope), to be essentially necessary to 'a sacrament.' Concerning this there are two things to be enquired into, (1) Whether this doth not render all pretence of infallibility with you a vain and useless thing: (2) Whether it be not in itself an error. He [the primate] was shewing that your claim of infallibility is of no use at all for the settling of truth and peace in the church, because no man can either know or believe this infallibility. It cannot be believed with Divine faith, having no foundation in the written word of God or tradition of the catholic church: and no human faith can be sufficient in order to it. But neither can it be believed or known upon that decree of the councils of Florence and Trent, that the intention of the priest is necessary to the validity of a sacrament.

P. 539. "We make no more necessary to the essence of a sacrament than all men are judges of... you have no positive assurance of the priest's intention. The utmost you can pretend to is your having no ground to suspect it; which in many cases there may be.

P. 540. "In case the priest's intention be wanting, you must by your own confession be guilty of gross idolatry: and yet you cannot certainly know what the priest's intention was. This is plain in the case of the eucharist, whose adoration you profess to be lawful, because you suppose Christ to be present there [*i.e.* in His body]. Now this depends upon a thing impossible for you certainly to know; and that is the priest's intention in the consecration. For if the priest wanted that inward intention which you make necessary to the essence of a sacrament, then for all his pronouncing the words of consecration, *Hoc est corpus Meum*, Christ's body may not be there: and in case it be not there, you are by your own confession guilty of idolatry, for you do not then worship Christ, but merely the bread. Therefore supposing adoration of the eucharist upon your principle of transubstantiation were not idolatry, yet, since that depends on a thing impossible to be known, who can with a good conscience do that, in which he cannot be certain that, in the doing it, he may not commit the greatest idolatry? Wherefore, all the ill consequences of this doctrine of the intention of the priest considered, besides the palpable errors of it, never was any doctrine more imprudently contrived or more weakly managed than when this was decreed at the councils of Florence and Trent, &c., &c.

P. 560. *Against denying the cup to laymen*: and see VI. 564. After quoting Cyprian's letter 63, Stillingfleet says, "I insist on this testimony, not only for the clearness of it as to the custom of giving the cup to the people, but especially for the evidence contained in it of the unalterable nature of the institution of Christ. For that he looks on the great fault of them who ministered water instead of wine, that they therein departed from the example and precept of Christ. Now there cannot be produced any greater evidence of my obligation as to this than there is as to the giving of the cup itself. For here is Christ's example and institution equally as to both of them, and that in the same words, 'Drink ye all of it.' If that were such a departing from the institution to alter the liquor, would it not have been accounted as great to take away the cup wholly?... Upon the same reason doth pope Julius afterwards condemn the using milk instead of wine because contrary to Christ's institution: and so he doth the dipping the bread in the chalice: from whence we infer that they looked on Christ's example in the institution and administration to be unalterable. But most express is the testimony of pope Gelasius, who finding, some, from the remainders of Manicheism, did abstain from the cup, gives express order that they, who were infected with this odd superstition, either should receive the whole sacrament or abstain wholly from it: because the dividing one and the same mystery cannot be done without great sacrilege. To this Bellarmine says that two answers are commonly given: one that those

words are meant of priests; another that they relate only to those superstitious persons. But both of them are taken off sufficiently by the reason assigned, which is not fetched either from their priesthood or superstition, but only from the institution of Christ, that it would be sacrilege to part those things, which Christ by His institution had joined together. Thus we see the sense of the church is clear, not only for the practice but for the command too, and the sinfulness of the violation of it.

Vol. V. *Idolatry practised in the Church of Rome.* C. II. "In adoration of the host and invocation of saints. To take off the common answer, that this could not be idolatry because they believed the bread to be God; upon the same ground, I said, they who believe the sun to be God and worship him on that account would be excused from idolatry too...(1) supposing there were the same revelation of Christ's Divinity and of His presence in the eucharist by transubstantiation, yet there could not be the same reason for the adoration of the host as for worshipping Christ Himself. (2) That there are not the same motives and grounds to believe that doctrine of transubstantiation that there are to believe that Christ is God. (3) That supposing they are mistaken in their doctrine of transubstantiation, that doth not excuse them from idolatry. (4) That the same reason which would excuse them would excuse the most gross idolaters in the world.

Vol. VI. *The doctrine of the Trinity and Transubstantiation compared.* "S. Augustine saith, he [Eutychius] held but one substance after the union [of God and man in Christ]; so that he must deny any substance of a (human) body to remain after the union, which he averred to be wholly swallowed up, and the properties (only) to continue. Which was another kind of transubstantiation: for no more of the substance of Christ's body was supposed to remain after the union than there is supposed to be in the elements after consecration. But in both cases the properties and qualities were the same still. And it is observable that in the acts of the council of Chalcedon, Eutyches rejected it as a calumny cast upon him, that he should hold that Christ brought a body from Heaven. But the Eutychian doctrine lay in taking away the substance of the body and making the Divinity the sole substance, but with the accidents and properties of the body. And for this they produced the words of St John, 'The Word was made flesh,' which they urged with the same confidency that you now do, 'This is My body.' And when they were urged with difficulties, they made the same recourse to God's omnipotency, and the letter of Scripture, and made the same declamations against the use of reason that you now do: and withal they would not have the human nature to be annihilated, but to be changed into the Divine, just as your authors do about the substance of the bread.

So that it is hard to imagine a more exact parallel to transubstantiation than there is in this doctrine; and consequently there can be no more evident proof of it, than the fathers making use of the eucharist to shew, that as the substance of bread doth remain after consecration, so the substance of Christ's body doth continue after the union [*i.e.* of the Divine and human natures in Christ]. And when the fathers from the remaining properties do prove the substance to remain, they overthrow the possibility of transubstantiation. For, if they might be without the substance, their whole argument loses its force and proves just nothing.

P. 599. "I proceed to a second argument...and that is. from the natural and inseparable qualities of Christ's body, which are utterly inconsistent with the belief in transubstantiation; and the force of this argument lies in this, that the fathers did attribute such things to the body of Christ, which render it incapable of being present in such a manner in the sacrament as transubstantiation supposes. And no men who understand themselves will assert that at one time, which they must be bound to deny at another; but they will be sure to make an exception or limitation which may reconcile both together. As if you should say, That the body of Christ cannot be in more places than one, upon the doctrine of Thomas, ye (yet) should presently add 'with regard to 'the sacrament, *i.e.* not in regard of its natural presence, but in a 'sacramental it may.' So, if the fathers find an opinion like yours as to the body of Christ, they would have a reserve or exception as to the sacrament. But it appears by their writings that they attribute such properties in general to the body of Christ as overthrow any such presence (being) without exceptions or limitations. But this is not all, for I shall now prove (1) that they attribute circumscription to Christ's body in Heaven, so as to exclude the possibility of its being on earth; (2) that they deny any such thing as the supernatural existence of a body after the manner of a spirit.

P. 612. *That a body cannot be anywhere without dimensions.* P. (*i.e.* the Papist). "Hold a little: a body must have dimensions belonging to it: but it is not necessary it should have those dimensions wherever it is present; for it may be present in one place as a body, and in another after the manner of a spirit.

"Pr. (*i.e.* the Protestant). You might as well have said, a body may be considered two ways: as it is a body, and as it is not a body; for there can be no body where there are not dimensions proper to it.

"P. See how you are mistaken; for it is not the dimensions, which seem to hinder a body from being in two places at once, but its unity, as Bellarmine well observes.

"Pr. I say that both of them hinder, &c., &c.

P. 614. *The true interpretation of Hilary.* "P. But Hilary's testimony cannot be so avoided; who saith that we as truly eat Christ's flesh in the sacrament, as He was truly incarnate, &c.

"Pr. I do not deny this to be Hilary's sense [and then Stillingfleet makes the Protestant add], but yet this proves nothing like to transubstantiation. For it amounts to no more than a real presence of the body of Christ in the sacrament.

Then. S. defines a real presence of Christ's body to mean that the faithful at least as truly eat Christ's flesh in the sacrament, as He was truly incarnate. This is precisely what has been throughout maintained as the only proper sense of the words "a real presence" in this controversy; for who ever disputed the real presence of Christ's Godhead in the place of this sacrament and everywhere? and yet he makes the Protestant add, "All that he (Hilary) aimed at was to prove a real union between Christ and His people." Is it fair thus to slip off to the spiritual subjective sense of a "real union"? Let everyone examine for himself the extracts taken from Hilary. It is surely to be lamented that great divines should plead as partisans, and quit the higher ground of candid acknowledgment and unfearing adhesion to the simple truth. If fathers have erred, let it be confessed, and then they will retain all the honour that is legitimately theirs. The Bible must test both them and us; and what they added which is incoherent must fall away.

P. 713. "*A vindication of The Answer to some papers lately printed on the Authority of the Catholic Church.* 4. Auricular confession. The council of Trent declares secret confession of all sins to be necessary in order to remission and absolution by the priest [chiefly with a view to partaking of the Lord's supper]. Gregory the Great speaks of no other confession than what was required in order to the conciliation of those who had undergone public penance; the custom whereof at Rome is set down in Gelasius his sacramentary.

P. 63. "And Gregory refers to the custom then used, in his sacramentary.

P. 225. "And there is no form of absolution in either of them, but by way of prayer to God, which is different from a sacramental, judicial absolution, required by the council of Trent. He makes no absolution true but that which follows the judgment of God, which he parallels with the loosing of Lazarus after Christ had raised him from the grave. Hom. 26 in Evangel."



(AA.) DR ISAAC BARROW. B. 1630. D. 1677.

Charterhouse has the honour of his education. He lived but 47 years. Deduct from this the years spent in immaturity of body and in the training and filling of his mind, and we have only some ten or, at the most, seventeen years for the production of his marvellously clear and complete theological works. For also, much of his mind, after being elected fellow, must have been devoted to mathematics, as he stands out as the first Lucasian Professor in 1663. Sir Isaac Newton, his pupil, succeeded him in 1669. After this Dr Barrow survived but eight years. Making, then, all allowance for the growing up of systematic theology in such a mind as Dr Barrow's, and for some theological writing being done in the period before this, one may yet express surprise at the three folio volumes, and a smaller one entitled *Opuscula*, filled with such complete treatises as Barrow has left to the world. To particularize them is unnecessary. It is sufficient that not Usher himself, nor William Tyndale, nor that gem of the fathers on the subject of this work, Theodore, has more clearly expressed scriptural opinions on the Lord's supper. Dr Barrow's desire seems to have been to follow the words of Him Who brought truth as well as grace to His church in the fulness of time, and those other words in which His servant Paul first declares what the Lord had committed to him, and then comments upon it, and alone of all the apostles directs the church of Christ what she is to believe regarding the Lord's supper to the end of time, *i.e.* until Christ come again.

*The doctrine of the Sacraments.* Vol. I. London, 1687.

P. 542. Barrow says that when signs belong to Divine things they are called sacraments.

P. 549. "That these symbolical things and actions did represent our Saviour's body given and broken [and] our Saviour's blood shed and poured out for us in sanction of the new covenant. 'Do this,' saith our Lord, 'for My remembrance,' or in commemoration of Me, *i.e.* so as thereby to have raised in you a reflexion of mind and heart upon those grievous pains which I shall have endured for your sake, to procure for you a remission of sins and

reconciliation to God...1 Cor. xi. 26, 'Ye tell forth,' or significantly express the death of our Lord, till He come, *i.e.* during His absence from us....A solemn and sensible representation, wherein we behold Him crucified as it were *in effigie*...it being, in a sort, a putting us into the circumstances of those who did behold our Saviour for us hanging on the cross...our Lord being absent from us, sitting in Heaven at God's right hand.

P. 532. "St Paul, 1 Cor. xi. To 'discern' or distinguish our Lord's body, *i.e.* yielding a peculiar reverence of mind and behaviour in regard thereto—a devotion of heart consisting of hearty contrition for our sins, which did expose our Saviour to the enduring of such pains.

P. 559. "We in the outward action partake of the symbols representing our Saviour. We in the spiritual intention communicate of His very person, being (according to the manner insinuated) intimately united to Him. Bread is the staff of life, the most common, most necessary, the most wholesome and at the same time the most savoury meat. Wine is the most pleasant and wholesome, also the most sprightly and cordial drink. By them, therefore, our Lord chose to represent that body and blood, by the oblation of which a capacity of life and health was procured to mankind; the taking in which by right apprehension, tasting it by hearty faith, *digesting* it by careful *attention* and *meditation*, converting *it into our substance* by *devout, grateful and holy affections*, joined with steady resolutions of living answerable thereto, will certainly support and maintain our spiritual life in a vigorous health and happy growth in grace, refreshing our hearts with comfort and satisfaction unspeakable. *He that doeth this* eats our Saviour's flesh and drinks His blood; *i.e.* who, as our Saviour interpreteth it, doth believe in Him; that belief importing all other acts of mind and will connected with right persuasion concerning Him, hath eternal life and shall live for ever, as Himself declares and promises; which benefits, therefore, in *the due performance of this holy duty* are conveyed to us."

(BB.) JOHN TILLOTSON. B. 1630. D. 1694.

He was born at Sowerby near Halifax. His father was a clothier and a strict Calvinist, and sent him to Clare Hall. But when Charles II. was restored to the throne, Tillotson felt able to conform, and was made a Prebendary of Canterbury and chaplain to the King. He was afterwards made dean of St Paul's. He stood stedfast against all the plausible attempts of general comprehension, discerning the animus of the court. He attended

on Lord William Russell at his execution, and when Sancroft became a nonjuror at the elevation of William III. to the vacant throne, Tillotson was made primate. His three volumes of sermons are diversely estimated; but upon them his reputation as a preacher must stand. I suppose the treatise, from which I have quoted, to be his. It is a little too broad in its style to make large citations useful. I would not pass over so great and popular and enlightened a primate.

*A discourse against Transubstantiation.* London, 1864. Ascribed to Archbishop Tillotson in a book from the library of the late Duke of Sussex.

P. 21. "I shall now in the second place speak of the particular time and occasion of the coming in of this doctrine [Transubstantiation] and by what steps and degrees it grew up and was advanced into an article of faith in the Romish Church. The doctrine of the corporal presence of Christ *was first* started upon occasion of the dispute about the worship of images, in opposition whereto the synod of Constantinople about the year 750 did argue thus, That our Lord having left us no other image of Himself but the sacrament, in which the substance of bread is the image of His body, we ought to make no other image of our Lord. [As to the inaccuracy of the assertion that the corporal presence of Christ in this sacrament was not affirmed till the dispute about the worship of images, it is sufficient to refer to the teaching of Cyril of Jerusalem and most of the writers in the fourth century. Image-worship is supposed to have become rife in the fifth century, and the dispute about it in the Eastern church was later, say in the time of Copronymus.] In answer to this argument the second council of Nice in the year 787 did declare that the sacrament after consecration is not the image and antitype of Christ's body and blood, but is properly His body and blood. So that the corporal presence of Christ was first brought in to support the stupid worship of images... And as this was the first occasion of introducing this doctrine among the Greeks, so in the Latin or Roman church Paschasius Radbertus, first a monk and afterwards Abbot of Corbey, was the first broacher of it in the year 818. [Assertions like this are so common that appello Cæsarem. I ask every man to judge for himself: and the aim of these volumes is simply to facilitate the appeal by setting together a large number of the principal passages from the first century downwards in their original languages and with a translation.]

P. 41. "Upon the whole matter I shall only say this, that some other points between us and the Church of Rome are

managed with some kind of wit and subtilty, but this of transubstantiation is carried out by mere dint of impudence and facing down of mankind. And of this the discerning persons of that church are of late grown so sensible that they would now be glad to be rid of that odious doctrine. But the council of Trent hath fastened it to their religion and made it a necessary and essential point of their belief, and they cannot now part with it if they would. It is like a millstone hung about the neck of Popery, which will sink it at the last; and though some of their greatest wits, as Cardinal Perron and of late M. Arnauld, have undertaken the defence of it in great volumes, yet it is an absurdity of that monstrous and massy weight that no human authority or wit are able to support it. It will make the very pillars of S. Peter's crack, and requires more volumes to make it good than would fill the Vatican... Credulity is certainly a fault as well as infidelity; and He Who said 'Blessed are they that have not seen and yet 'have believed,' hath nowhere said, 'Blessed are they that have 'seen and yet have not believed,' much less 'Blessed are they that 'believe directly contrary to what they see.'

P. 43. "This doctrine of theirs being first plainly proved by us to be destitute of all Divine warrant and authority, our objections against it from the manifold contradictions of it to reason and sense are so many demonstrations of the falsehood of it. Against all which they have nothing to put in the opposite scale but the infallibility of their church, for which there is even less colour of proof from Scripture."

(CC.) BISHOP BULL. B. 1634. D. 1710.

A native of Wells. Entered at Exeter College. No one can dispute his right to be ranked among the great men of the Church of England. His *Harmonia Apostolica* was however, prophetically at least, an infelicitous title; for it brought anything rather than unity and peace to the subject of man's justification. And in all candour it must be allowed that the extract from it, given as his true confession of faith, in his life by the notable Robert Nelson, p. 395, is set to a different keynote from the teachings of St Paul and St James. No wonder then that his treatise called up much and long controversy. Perhaps this is the chief reason why he was not made bishop till he was 71.

His other great subject, those revealed characteristics of God's nature, which form the ground of the Athanasian Creed, was

handled with greater prudence, and has left the church under larger obligation. His views on the compatibility of subordination with equality of nature and power seem to be just. He is safer than Dr Clarke. Nevertheless the mind rejects his principle, p. 366, of "submitting our judgment to that of the catholic doctors, where they are found generally to concur in the interpretation of a text of Scripture, how absurd soever that interpretation may at first seem to be." This is an amount of submission which we can only render to God's word. The extracts in this very volume seem to prove a direct negative to this rule: for the general interpretation of the text "This is My body," to say no more, verges on the absurd, and it does not seem right to submit to it. In fact Bull's rule breaks in upon and supersedes the duty of private judgment; and is directly contrary to the immortal teaching of Bull's great contemporary, Chillingworth. But no student of the fathers would like to lose Bull's aid, especially in judging of the writers of the first three centuries.

If such be at all a right measure of this author, there is little room to wonder that his views on the Lord's supper somewhat departed from the simplicity that was in Paul and in our Lord.

*Corruptions of the Church of Rome, in answer to Bossuet.*  
Oxford.

II. 308. "Come we now to the principal part of the Christian worship, the holy Sacrament of the Eucharist. [On taking the cup from the laity he refers to Bishop Davenant.]... But the worst ceremony of all is the elevation of the host, to be adored by the people, as very Christ Himself under the appearance of bread, whole Christ, Θεανθρωπος, God and man, while they neglect the old sursum corda, the lifting up of their hearts to Heaven where whole Christ indeed is... thinking that a piece of bread can by any means whatsoever or howsoever consecrated and blessed, become their very God and Saviour. [A part of this is only rhetorical censure—we do not call it logical: so also a part of what follows.] Moreover by what reason, by what Scripture, by what example or practice of the primitive churches, can the Romanists defend their carrying about of the blessed Sacrament in procession? &c. [A Papist would plead in behalf of processions that they make people believe and adore Christ's bodily presence. Had the bishop omitted "by what reason" his appeal would have been logical and stronger, ad homines. But now we come to the bishop's own views.]

P. 252. "They (the primitive fathers) held the eucharist to be a commemorative sacrifice; and so do we. This is the constant language of the ancient liturgies, *Μεμνημένοι προσφέρομεν*, 'We offer by way of commemoration.'... In the eucharist then Christ is offered... Every sacrifice is directed to God and the oblation therein made, whatsoever it be, hath God for its object. In the holy eucharist therefore we set before God the bread and wine. [Mingled with this in his sentences are views of another tone and a different nature and tendency.] '*As figures or images*,' &c., the very words of the Clementine Liturgy, *τὰ ἀντίτυπα*... and [we] plead to God the merits of His Son's sacrifice once offered on the cross for us sinners and in this sacrament *represented*... offered not hypostatically, as the Trent fathers determined (for so was He but once offered) but commemoratively only, not a bare remembering or putting ourselves in mind of Him.

"To conclude this matter. The ancients held the oblation of the eucharist to be answerable in some respect to the legal sacrifices, *i.e.* they believed that our blessed Saviour ordained the sacrifice of the eucharist as a rite of prayer and praise to God instead of the manifold and bloody sacrifices of the law... Instead therefore of slaying of beasts and burning of incense, &c., the fathers I say believed God appointed this sacrifice of bread and wine [&c. as before; see Mede's Christian sacrifice]. The eucharistical sacrifice, thus explained, is indeed *λογικὴ θυσία*, a reasonable sacrifice, &c. The other branch of the article is concerning transubstantiation [he quotes the words of institution]. But these words could not be true in a proper sense, &c., &c. These words must necessarily be understood in a figurative sense... a representation of My death and passion near approaching, &c. Little foundation hath this doctrine of transubstantiation in the primitive church, as appears sufficiently from what has been said concerning the notion then universally received of the eucharistical sacrifice [the reference to the Clementine Liturgy, &c., previously quoted]... The ancient doctors, yea the liturgies of the church affirm the eucharist to be *incruentum sacrificium*, 'a sacrifice without blood.'... [Greg. Naz., Cyril, Jerome and Ambrose.] We are not ignorant that the ancient fathers generally teach that the bread and wine in the eucharist, by or upon the consecration of them, do become and are made the body and blood of Christ. But we know also that though they do not all explain themselves the same way, yet they do all declare their sense to be very dissonant from the doctrine of transubstantiation. Some of the most ancient fathers, as Justin Martyr and Irenæus, seem to have had this notion that by or upon the sacerdotal benediction the Spirit of Christ or a Divine virtue from Christ descends upon the elements and accompanies them to all worthy communicants, and that therefore they are said to be, and are, the body and blood of Christ—the

same Divinity which is hypostatically united to the body of Christ in Heaven being virtually united to the elements of bread and wine on earth, &c., &c.

All this is what became preeminently the theology of the seventeenth century on this subject—a kind of swaying to and fro between Roman doctrine and the Bible. Few ages have stood clear of it, nor did Calvin. In fact part of this is purely his doctrine. This kind of teaching is (1) The Lord's supper is a sacrifice, yet not in the Romish way. But the answer is, Where did our Lord or St Paul call it a sacrifice? "Christ our Passover" refers not to the Lord's supper but to Christ's death. And in spite of the great Bishop of Hippo, "the commemoration of a sacrifice" is a radically distinct idea from "a commemorative sacrifice." (2) It is teaching that the bread and wine "become and are" by consecration (by utterance of words or by the descent of the Spirit) Christ's body and blood, only not according to the full interpretation of Rome; and (3) It is declaring that "virtually" Christ's Godhead in Heaven is united to the bread and wine on the altar (*i.e.* the table). What is this but a presence on the holy table of Christ's human body and soul and Divinity too?

*Vindication of the Church of England*, Vol. III.  
Works, Oxford, 1827.

P. 208. "Let indifferent persons that have travelled abroad in the world judge here; and they will tell us that nothing doth more alienate the hearts of the Jews and Mahometans too from Christianity, than the image worship and *bread* worship (so directly contrary to both their laws) which they see with their eyes practised by them that call themselves the only true Christians... What a mountain in their way is the article of transubstantiation, which a man cannot receive without renouncing his reason and all his senses too! Every man hath heard of one great person (Averroës, and we have reason to believe there have been many more of this mind) that was turned off from Christianity by this just prejudice, 'If the Christians worship the God which they eat, my soul be with the philosopher.'"

(DD.) ISAAC AMBROSE. B. 1604. D. 1674.

His book is entitled "Looking unto Jesus: a view of the "everlasting gospel, &c." It tells nothing about the author's birth-

place, domicile, or parentage. Only it is dedicated to the Right Honourable William, Earl of Bedford, Lord Russell, Baron of Thornehaugh. But his portrait makes you wish to know more of him. A heavenly-minded bishop or an ancient saint might have sat for the portrait: and at its foot is inscribed, "The effigies of Isaac Ambrose, *Ætatis suæ*, 59, 1663." The treatise itself which gives the volume its name contains passages seldom equalled in any writer, and perhaps hardly ever surpassed. The portrait and the book are like two pieces of music in the same strain: I hardly like to say *variations* of the same heavenly air: they seem so alike. He was born in Lancashire and went to Brazenose and took orders: but at the rebellion took the covenant: and as a presbyterian minister fed the flock, first at Garstang and then at Preston. His first volume ends with Herbert's poem on the word *Jesu*. The second contains *War with Devils*, *Communion*, and *Ministration of Angels*; also, *First, Middle and Last Things*: and a single sermon, on redeeming the time, at the funeral of the Lady Margaret Houghton, preached at Preston.

*On the Lord's Supper. Looking to Jesus, &c.* London, 1674.

Sn. 15, p. 278. "By body and blood of Christ we mean whole Christ. (1) His person, God and man, (2) His merit, (3) His virtue, which is the power and efficacy of *His Godhead*, (4) His benefits both of grace and glory. All these are *enclosed* in the body of Christ and the blood of Christ [Why not "included" in the representative terms?] (1) Because we could not be partakers of the Divine nature but by means of the manhood. For the flesh of Christ is the conduit that conveys the graces of the Godhead and the graces of the Spirit of Christ into our souls... which otherwise than by His body we could not receive. [Ambiguous. Is the reference to His body slain on Calvary? Let us receive it so. For if we were to take it of His natural body supposed present in the Lord's supper, we should have just Dr Andrewes over again in this eminent Puritan writer.] (2) Because Christ perfected redemption in His body. [This must refer to the sacrifice on Calvary.] How should the body and blood of Christ—*thus understood*—be in the soul of a man? (1) There is a human nature defiled. (2) A Christian inward nature animated by the Spirit of Christ. [I think he means Christ's own Divine Spirit.] If [the inward nature] is upholden in the children of God by things answerable to its nature; and *to this* indeed... the Lord offers in His sacrament Christ's *proper body and blood*, as its own proper



food. [Andrewes' manner of speech.] Christ therefore, as in the soul spiritually, in the spiritual part of us. It is the inner man, the spiritual nature, that receives Christ's body and blood. *Marginal note.* His body and blood *are not* substantially in us. Christ corporally is only in Heaven. But He is really and spiritually in the spiritual part of us. [This note will make some justify all the prior expressions. But why write in so inconsistent phrases?]

Sn. 12. "Examination of our desires after this ordinance. (1) If they carry the soul after Christ—fellowship—communion, fruition, &c. (2) If a sense of the want of Christ, or sense of former goodness or sweetness in Christ, found in the use of ordinances. (3) If an holy kind of impatience in the want of the ordinance, 'When shall I come? &c.' (4) If nothing but Christ will content the soul—desired for Himself. If the soul be content with Christ. (5) If a great and sweet contentment in the use of the ordinances; if (as it was with Sampson drinking of the water which God sent him out of the hollow of the jaw) our spirits come again and revive upon it, so that sometimes the heart is filled with strange ecstasy—with excess of spiritual pleasures—with an holy kind of satisfaction, contentation and delight. (6) If there follow after the ordinance holy vows and wishes of infinite and eternal thankfulness—as also a growing and springing up as among the grass, as willows by the watercourses. [A man must go to the widely misrepresented and unread Zwingel to find so much Scriptural rapture and practical piety in connexion with this sacrament. It is impossible not to discern and admire it. But if anyone is half inclined to infer that if a man's experience is so rich and Heavenly, his doctrine and the phrases he adopts to express it must be correct, only let him read the spiritual aspirations, I say not of Thomas à Kempis, but of Savonarola, and what will he say to this genuine devotion ascending from a mind wholly given to the holding and defence of transubstantiation in all its fulness? What can we say but that head and heart often stand wide apart? God is graciously pleased to spiritualize the soul even when customs and the prevalence of error are allowed to shut up the understanding against sound doctrine. The Scripture and the Spirit sometimes feed the heart only. So taught also Taylor and Heber.]

P. 277. "Look upon the wounds of Christ as healing wounds, whither thy soul pursued by the avenger of blood may fly for safety and sanctuary... The nails, the spear, the wounds all preach unto faith a reconciled God. Dwell in the rock and be like the dove, that makes her nest in the side of the hole's mouth. Cant. ii. 14, and Jerem. xlviii. 28.... And so the saints communicate to God, in the same way that God communicates to them.

They are always worshipping God *immediately, not through ordinances*. They are always communicating themselves, and all that they are or have to God, fully, and freely.

P. 470. (4) "In communion with God there is a *familiar converse* between God and the saints; (a) God manifests Himself in a suitable way to the conditions of His people—so condescending to their condition, that, though His majesty be infinite, it shall in no way be a terror unto them. The Scripture speaks of the familiar intercourse that God hath with His people here, that they are called friends. Abraham was called the friend of God, and the disciples were called friends. But hereafter the friendship shall be more full and sweet. (b) God opens Himself to His saints. Much is said of God's opening Himself to His people here; Ps. xxv. 14, Prov. iii. 32, 1 Cor. ii. 16, Cant. i. 4, 'They are 'brought into His chamber.' ... The mysteries of the kingdom are revealed to the saints here: (but) much more in Heaven. God will there reveal all His secrets. They shall *not only* see His face; but they shall *see God's heart*.

P. 469. "To see God in ourselves. It is an happiness to see God in the creature [the creation], but much more in ourselves [in all the redeemed]. The chiefest of the glory of God (next to that which appears in Christ as God-man) shall appear in the saints. The chief excellency of God that the saints see except Himself shall be within themselves. They shall see more of the glory of God *within themselves* than in all the Heavens besides. [How Lady Houghton and all the faithful in the Earl of Bedford's household must have rejoiced in such preaching !]

I am fain to draw upon Ambrose for a representation of that communion with God in Heaven, which is the Lord's supper's highest antitype and consummation. It is given in details, division and subdivision, "cycle on epicycle, orb on orb," after the manner which was then in use in preaching.

P. 469. *Heaven's happiness*. "To be with God implies the glorious communion with God. *Union is the ground of Communion*. In this life there is a communion that the Scripture speaks of, 'Our fellowship is with the Father and His Son Jesus Christ,' and 'The communion of the Holy Ghost be with you,' saith the apostle. But certainly it shall be another manner of communion that the saints shall have with God in the world to come. Now this communion—it stands either in regard of the *work of God* upon and towards His saints, or the *work of the saints* upon and towards God. *For communion is on both sides* ... (1) Communion consists in *the delight they have in one another*. There is full,

actual, mutual, everlasting delight between God and the saints in Heaven. (2) In communion there is a *mutual wishing and willing of good to one another*. Now God shall wish all good to the saints and they [shall] wish all good to God. But what good can they wish or will to God? It is true there can be no addition to His essential goodness, but they can will that this His goodness be honoured and praised. (3) In communion there is the *communion of what one hath* unto another. And thus God communicates Himself to His saints immediately, fully, freely, everlastingly!"

(EE.) PASQUIER QUESNEL. B. 1634. D. 1719.

He rose to high eminence as a student of patristic theology and Pastor of L'Oratoire in Paris: but, venturing in his edition of Leo the Great to defend the Gallican liberties, he was exiled from his native country, and had nothing left for him but to join Antoine Arnauld, who had been driven from Paris by the Jesuits after a long and able struggle, and had established himself at Brussels. The Jesuits who had trodden the lovers of Jansenius under foot by condemning 15 of the propositions of Duvergier, selected 101 from the Moral Reflexions of Jansenius on the N. T., verse by verse; and by these texts dealt in like manner with Quesnel's followers. Daniel Wilson the Bishop of Calcutta caused the comment on the Four Gospels to be translated and printed in English. Our extracts exhibit Quesnel's excellencies. Bossuet appears among those whose high commendations had sanctioned Quesnel's last and great work, on the New Testament.

Quesnel, Matt. xxvi. 20. "The Son of God, in this last assembly which comprehends in brief all the church, makes us see the church in which the good are mingled with the weak and the wicked, who are all united in an external profession of the same faith and in a partaking of the same sacraments. V. 26. The end of the same figures. Not to look for anything there but

*On Matt. xxvi. 20. Amsterdam, 1727.*

Le fils de Dieu dans cette dernière assemblée, qui comprend en abrégé toute l'église, nous l'a fait voir mêlée de bons de foibles et des mechans, qui sont tous unis dans la profession extérieure d'une même foi et dans la participation des mêmes sacremens ... V. 26. ... la fin des figures mêmes. N'y chercher donc encore que des figures c'est pretendre que

figures is to pretend that Jesus Christ was not able to explain Himself clearly in His last determinations and in the most holy and most important testamentary disposition that ever was made. If it is not His own body veritably and really, it must by a horrible blasphemy be the case, that He did not wish men to understand Him on an occasion when right and reason demand that there should not be the least word obscure and doubtful. V. 27. Sacrifice is an admirable invention of God's wisdom, in which all is rendered to God by His creature, and where all is given to the creature by its God afresh in the communion. V. 28. Religion and affiance in God confirmed by the blood of the true victim. As long as religion shall be on the earth, and this alliance which is but begun shall be accomplished in the course of ages, this blood also must be on the earth, *really present* to those that contract the alliance; it must be there offered to God; and the sprinkling of it must take place by the communion in those Christian hearts in which the alliance is made. And what is that if it be not a sacrifice?... Mark xiv. 22. Jesus, Who as God has created bread to nourish our bodies, having Himself taken a body like to ours, changes the bread into His own body to nourish our souls, and to change us into Himself... V. 24. It is the last for Judas, and often for many other. Luke xxii. 18. Jesus Christ talks here of two passovers, one legal, the other Heavenly, before He speaks of the Christian passover which is between the two. This last is the truth of the figurative passover, and the pledge of

---

J. C. n'a pu s'expliquer clairement de ses dernières volontés et de la disposition testamentaire la plus sainte et la plus importante qui fût jamais. S'il n'est pas son corps *véritablement et réellement* ["verily and indeed"] il faudroit, par une blasphème horrible, qu'Il n'a pas voulu que l'on entendit dans une occasion où le droit et la raison demandent qu'il n'y ait pas la moindre parole obscure ni equivoque. V. 27. Le sacrifice est une invention admirable de la sagesse de Dieu ou tout est rendu à Dieu par sa creature, et où tout est donné de nouveau à la creature par son Dieu dans la communion. V. 28. La religion et l'alliance avec Dieu, confirmée par le sang de la vraie victime. Tant que la religion sera sur la terre, et que cette alliance, qui n'est que commencée, s'y achevera dans le cours des siècles, il faut que ce sang soit aussi sur la terre, *réellement présent* à ceux qui contractent l'alliance; qu'il y soit *offert à Dieu*; et que l'aspersion s'en fasse par la communion dans le cœur des Chrétiens ou se fait l'alliance. Et qu'est ce que tout cela sinon un sacrifice? On Mark xiv. 22, Jesus qui comme Dieu a créé le pain pour nourrir nos corps, ayant pris Lui même un corps semblable au nôtre, *change le pain en son corps* pour nourrir nos âmes, et pour nous changer en Lui même. V. 24. C'est le dernier pour Judas, et souvent pour beaucoup d'autres. On Luke xxii. 18, J. C. parle ici des deux pâques; l'une legale et l'autre céleste, avant que de parler de la pâque chrétienne qui est entre les deux et qui tient les deux. Cette dernière est la vérité de la pâque figura-

the Heavenly passover. V. 19. The institution of the sacrifice of the priest and of the sacrament of the altar of the new law are three different benefits, of which each one merits a particular consideration and review ... What is it to celebrate the holy sacrifice and to communicate in memory of Jesus Christ? It is to make His death present by faith in giving up one's-self. V. 20. The adorable institution of sacrifice teaches three effusions of Christ's blood. The first on the altar: the second on the cross: the third in our heart ... 1 Cor. xi. 24. If these words 'This is My body' had any need of explanation, and ought only to be understood of a figure, how could Jesus Christ, Himself teaching this great mystery to the apostle and the apostle announcing it to the faithful, have left these words in their obscurity and equivocal character? Would not this be to lead the faithful of all ages into error?" [Note. We totally object to deny to Christ the use of allegory. The higher the topic the more He often seems to deem it fit to use it.]

---

tive ; et le gage de la pâque céleste. V. 19. L'institution du sacrifice du sacerdoce et du sacrement de l'autel de la nouvelle loi sont trois bien-faits differens qui meritent chacun une consideration et une reconnaissance particuliere.... Qu'est ce que celebrer le saint sacrifice et communier en memoire de Jesus Christ? C'est le faire, en se rendant, Sa mort presente par la foi. V. 20. L'institution du sacrifice adorable renseigne trois effusions du sang de Jesus Christ. La I. sur l'autel : la II. sur la croix ; la III. dans notre cœur. On 1 Cor. xi. 24. Si ces paroles, Ceci est Mon corps, avoient eu besoin d'explication, et ne devoient être entendus que d'une figure, comment Jesus Christ, apprenant Lui même à l'apôtre ce grand mystere, et l'apôtre l'annonçant aux fideles auroient ils laissé ces paroles dans leur obscurité et leur equivoque? N'auroit ce pas été induire en erreur les fideles de tous les siècles ?

(FF.) PHILIP VAN LIMBORCH. B. 1633. D. 1712.

The extracts taken from this writer, who is the best delineator of Remonstrant doctrine, and who with Arminius, Grotius, and Episcopius, makes up the chief men of that school, are strikingly in harmony with many of the doctrinal utterances in our Book of Common Prayer. He was pastor of his native city Amsterdam ; and also professor in the Gymnasium of that city. One of his books contains biographies of Arminius, Vossius, and Grotius. Another is a Commentary on the Acts, Romans, and Hebrews. A third is an account of the inquisition : and he edited the writings of his grand-uncle, Episcopius and other Arminian divines. He held a controversy, which is still in print, with Isaac Orobio of

Seville, a learned and half infidel Jew, and another with a Portuguese Deist, who only held the God of nature. His works shew that he had a lively mind and a kind disposition. He was devoted also to history, and published letters of illustrious men, that throw light on the settlement of a colony of Remonstrants in the duchy of Schleswig, and on the building of Frederickstadt by their hands. His first ministry began at Goude in 1657. He moved to the capital in 1667, and was made professor in the same year.

*Christian Theology.*

P. 612. "This rite consists in the eating of bread publicly broken by the minister before the whole assembly and in the drinking of wine publicly poured out with faith prayers and giving of thanks. Whether that bread be unleavened or fermented is a thing indifferent. It is certain that our Lord Jesus, according to the prescription of the Mosaic law, that to eat the passover with fermented bread was unlawful, used unleavened bread. He did not however will that we should be superstitiously tied to that custom. It suffices that bread be broken, of whatever kind it be, *i.e.* whatever be fit for being broken and for nourishment of the body.

P. 617. 1. "The opinion of Luther and Lutherans is different. That the substance doubtless of bread and wine remains indeed in the supper; but, since the Lord said, This is My body, they lay down that the body also of Christ is truly and really present in with or under (the sign) bread, and is delivered to the communicants, and is truly eaten by them with the mouth. But in what mode the body of Christ is truly present there, they say is inscrutable to our reason and belongs to the secret treasured things of God's wisdom and

*Theologia Christiana.* Amsterdam, 1695. P. 612. C. 70. 4.

Consistat hic ritus in esu panis a ministro publice coram toto cœtu fracti et potu vini publice effusi cum fide precibus et gratiarum actione. Utrum panis ille sit azymus an fermentatus indifferens est. Certum est Dominum Jesum, juxta legis Mosaicæ præscriptum, quod pascha pane fermentato edere nefas, pane azymo usum. Nos tamen illi superstitiose alligatos noluit. Sufficit panem frangi, qualiscumque sit, hoc est, quidquid ad frangendum et corpus alendum aptum sit.

P. 617. C. 71. 1.

Altera est Lutheri et Lutheranorum sententia. Panis nimirum et vini substantiam in cœnâ quidem remanere: sed quoniam Dominus dixit, Hoc est corpus Meum, statuunt et corpus Christi in cum vel sub pane vere ac realiter præsens esse, et communicantibus tradi et ab ipsis ore vere manducari. Quomodo autem corpus Christi illic vere adsit, dicunt esse rationi nostræ imperscrutabile, et pertinere ad arcanos sapientiæ et

omnipotence. For it is irreconcilable with the truth of Christ's body, which is circumscribed and bounded in some certain place. But that place is in Heaven. Therefore it cannot be really present in the supper. II. To this argument two solutions are usually attempted. Luther indeed, to escape the force of this argument, carried away by the heat of disputation, contended that Christ's body is by His sitting at God's right hand present everywhere, because God's right hand is everywhere. But he seems to have borrowed the doctrine of ubiquity from Jacob Faber of Suabia, who, at the teaching of the most learned George Calixtus, was the first to propose that dogma to the Christian world, as before his time it had never even been heard of in Christ's church. Afterwards however Luther seems to have let go the dogma of ubiquity and to have founded the presence of Christ's body in the supper on the words of the institution of it, as most Lutherans have done since; except that since then by the efforts of some, especially John Brentius and James Andrew, they have called it back into various Lutheran churches, not without great commotion and tumult, and yet it was always contradicted by many. But the ubiquity of Christ's body is subject to great difficulties. For besides that it is repugnant to the nature of a body to be everywhere, a body that is everywhere cannot be moved from one place to another. Further—a thing yet more opposed to reason, it will demand the power to penetrate within dimensions. For our bodies, which are in some one place, must be penetrated by that body which is everywhere.

---

omnipotentiae Divinae thesauros. Pugnat enim cum veritate corporis Christi, quod certo aliquo in loco circumscriptum et definitum est. Illud autem est in cœlo. Ergo realiter in cœna adesse nequit. II. Huic argumento duplex solutio quæri solet. Lutherus quidem, ut argumenti hujus vim elideret, æstu disputationis abreptus, contendit corpus Christi per sessionem ad dexteram Dei ubique adesse, quia dextera Dei ubique est. Videtur autem ubiquitatis dogma mutuatus a Jacobo Fabro Stapulensi, qui, docente doctissimo Georgio Calixto, primus illud orbi Christiano propinavit, cum ante eum ne auditum quidem fuisset in ecclesia Christi. Postea tamen Lutherus dogma ubiquitatis missum fecisse videtur, et præsentiam corporis Domini in cœnâ fundasse super verbis institutionis, uti plerique postea Lutherani; nisi quod postea, annitentibus præsertim Joanne Brentio et Jacobo Andreâ, id in varias Lutheranorum ecclesias revocasse, non sine gravi motu et tumultu, cui tamen a multis semper contradictum fuit. Atqui ubiquitas corporis Christi magnis laborat difficultatibus. Præterquam enim quod naturæ corporis repugnet ubique esse, corpus, quod ubique est, moveri non poterit de loco in locum. Imo, quod rationi magis adversatur, dabitur penetratio dimensionum. Corpora enim nostra, quæ alicubi sunt, necesse ut penetret corpus illud quod ubique est, &c., &c.

P. 617. "III. (2) We reply, Although many things are granted to Christ's human nature through its being exalted to God's right hand, yet the nature of the body itself has not been destroyed. Doubtless there are some essential properties of human nature, the destruction of which would make its human nature cease to be human nature. Of this kind, with reference to body, is the being bounded and circumscribed to a certain spot of the same measure with itself. Other properties are accidental, such as neither constitute its nature, nor of necessity follow from its constitution, but can be absent without destroying its nature. Of this kind some are infirmities, as to hunger, to thirst, to be affected with sorrow, &c.; others are perfections, as strength, agility, wisdom, &c. The essential properties Christ retains even in His own exalted state.

P. 618. "v. But others of those that are disposed to follow Luther hold that through Divine power the body can be present in such a way, however, as not to fill up (its) space. But truly, who, that is free from prejudice, does not detect in this a manifest contradiction, that body, which is no other than substance extended and impenetrable, can exist in such a way as not to fill the place commensurable to its extension?" [Leibnitz or less than Leibnitz would easily elude this mode of putting the argument. Ether penetrates luminous bodies.]

It is an error to suppose that the dogma of Christ's body being everywhere had not even been heard of in Christ's church till the

P. 617.

III. (2) Respondemus, Licet per exaltationem ad dexteram Dei humanæ Jesu Christi naturæ multa concessa sunt dona, non tamen natura corporis ipsius destructa est. Aliæ nimirum sunt proprietates naturæ essentialis, quibus destructis natura humana desinit esse humana. Hujusmodi, respectu corporis, sunt, finitum et certo sibi commensurato loco circumscriptum esse. Aliæ sunt accidentariæ, quæ naturam non constituunt nec ejus constitutionem necessario sequuntur, sed absque naturæ destructione abesse possunt. Harum aliæ sunt infirmitatis, ut esurire sitire tristari, &c., aliæ perfectionis ut robur agilitas sapientia, &c. Essentialis Christus etiam in exaltatione Suâ retinet.

P. 618.

v. Alii vero e Lutheri sequacibus... posse corpus per omnipotentiam Divinam esse præsens, ut tamen nullum repleat locum... Sed vero quis, prejudicii expers, hic non manifestam deprehendit contradictionem, corpus, quod est substantia extensa et impenetrabilis, posse existere ita tamen, ut non repleat locum extensioni suæ commensuratum. [As Limborch LXVII. 22 makes *εὐλογεῖν* mean give thanks, we may perhaps say that his logic and his Latin are stronger than his Greek, though his logic be not always perfect and "impenetrable."]



time of John Faber, author of the *Malleus Hereticorum*, and joint author with Eck and Cochleus. The contrary is very clearly shewn in Haag's *Conciles Premiers*; and in fact with rather undefined ideas on the nature of Christ's body a person would easily slip into Pantachianism. The one decisive Scripture notion of the body of Christ is that it cannot be in two or more places at once; and that to suppose this destroys the nature of Christ's human body, as it was on earth, and as it rose from the grave, and as we are, by all that there is in Scripture, led to believe that it still is and will be till "the second man is the Lord from Heaven." If this notion is lost, nothing preserves us from falling into ubiquitarianism except its general unpopularity.

(GG.) BISHOP WILLIAM BEVERIDGE, OF ST ASAPH.  
B. 1636. D. 1708.

Born at Barrow in Leicestershire. A voluminous writer, with a spirit much akin to that of Ken, but with less of poetical brightness; a writer of a very grave order, and in very wide repute among English Christians for the practical utility of his works. He refused to sanction the Commonwealth or the Protectorate. He was made bishop in 1704, so that he held that office but four years. His first preferment was Ealing. His second took him to London. It was St Peter's, Cornhill. He was of St John's, Cambridge.

*Thesaurus*, Vol. IX. Ang.-Cath. Library.

1 Cor. xi. "And He said, Take, eat, *λάβετε, φάγετε*. (1) Take, not with mouth but with hand. So Cyprian saith, 'That the people have received the sacred mysteries from the deacons 'with their own hands.' Ep. 56 and Theb. p. 93. The right hand which received the body of Christ. How? Knowingly. (1) What it is in itself? Bread. (2) What it represents to us? The body of Christ. (3) Eat, not take, lay up; not take and carry about; break; not take and worship, but take and eat. Take and eat bread, not yet My body. V. 24. Not that really the body of Christ, or transubstantiated. This error broached by Damascenus and Amalarius. Opposed, Synod Constantinople, 338 bishops, Paschasius R., Bertram, J. Scotus, and Berengarius. In the West Transubstantiation coined Lateran Council, 1215 (Harduin VII. 18). The sign and sacrament of My body. V. 26. It is bread we eat and wine we drink in the eucharist, not the real body of

Christ....That we might often call Him to mind the sacrament of the Lord's supper was ordained, wherein every circumstance represents something of Christ....The right eating and drinking consists in three things: (1) In remembering Christ, (2) In assenting to these things, (3) *In applying the benefits of them to ourselves.*

P. 90. "The end (1) to remember Christ's death, (2) To represent it, (3) *To offer it*, (4) *To convey* it too, (5) To seal not signum only, but sigillum, Rom. iv. 2. [If a seal of the doctrine, it is equivalent to a powerful and lively signum.] V. 29. What eating and drinking? Not the body and blood of Christ, but sacramental bread and wine. The ignorant receives. (1) Such as know not the fundamentals of religion, (2) Such as know not the state of their own souls, (3) Such as know not the nature of the sacrament, &c. as before. How appears it that the impenitent are unworthy? (1) cannot discern the Lord's body, (2) mock the ordinance by acting and living contrary to it, and so provoke God.

*On the Thirty-nine Articles.* Article 28. Oxford, 1847.

P. 471. "Scripture and fathers holding forth so clearly that whosoever worthily receiveth the sacrament of the Lord's supper doth certainly partake of the body and blood of Christ, the devil thence took occasion to draw men into an opinion that the bread which is used in that sacrament is the very body that was crucified on the cross, and the wine, after consecration, the very blood that gushed out of His pierced side. [In the century that had passed since the examination of Ridley and Latimer at Oxford progress in clearness has been made. *Then* the Reformers, virtually pressed by Jerome's words, admitted that there was in the cup the very blood that came from Christ's side, only in a sacrament; here Beveridge (at the present day printed as an Anglo-Catholic divine) simply and without qualification denies that it is the very blood, and represents the devil as the author of that opinion among men. Still Beveridge affirms that the worthy communicant doth certainly partake of the body and blood of Christ, and he says this here without adding a word in explanation regarding those terms of St Paul. Yet he *gives explanation* later.] The time when this opinion was first broached was in the days of Gregory III. [in the eighth century], pope of Rome. The persons that were the principal abettors of it were Damascene in the Eastern [in the eighth century], and afterwards Amalarius in the Western churches. It was no sooner started *in the East*, but it was opposed by a famous council at Constantinople [the third, under C. Copronymus, the opponent of images, A.D. 754], consisting of 338 bishops, the opposers of idol-worship. But afterwards, in the second council of Nice [787], it was again defended; and in particular by Epiphanius the deacon, who confidently affirmed that 'after the consecration the 'bread and wine are called, are, and *are believed to be, properly,*

'the body and blood of Christ.' In the western also, &c. Paschasius... Rabanus... Erigena not only stuck at it, but refused it and wrote against it as a poisonous error.... Berengarius too... condemned for it in a council at Vercel [A.D. 1050] (where the book of Johannes Scotus on the eucharist was also condemned), and at another council held at Rome about the same time.... But in the Lateran council... 1215, &c., &c., council of Trent.... So that according to this opinion the bread and wine (which before are *properly* bread and wine only, and not the body and blood of Christ, are, after consecration, *as properly* the body and blood of Christ only, and not bread and wine, &c., &c.... (1) It cannot be proved by the Scriptures, (2) It is repugnant to them, (3) It overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, (4) It hath given occasion to many superstitions.

P. 477. "As Bellarmine himself acknowledgeth this proposition, This is My body, *cannot possibly be taken otherwise than significatively*, so as that the sense should be, This bread signifies My body; is a sign or sacrament of it, &c.

P. 479. "This fond opinion possessing their brains that the bread is the real body of Christ hung upon the cross and pierced for their sins, lo how zealous are they in wrapping it up neatly in their handkerchiefs, laying it up in their treasures, carrying it about in their processions, yea at length worshipping *and adoring it too*.

P. 483. John vi. 63. "As if he should have said, Though I do speak of eating My flesh, I would not have you think that *My very flesh* profiteth anything, *or quickeneth*. [This is in direct antagonism to Cyril of Alexandria, and may be taken in explanation of the words first quoted from this treatise.] 'No it is the 'spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing'; and the words that I speak unto you *are not to be understood* in a carnal but in a spiritual sense, for they are spirit and life, plainly shewing that the corporal eating of this body is unprofitable, and that whatsoever He said concerning eating of His flesh and drinking of His blood was still to be understood in a Heavenly and spiritual sense, &c., &c.

P. 487. "...it was presently conceived that something more than ordinary honour should be conferred upon it; yea that it was not only to be eaten, but laid up privately, yea carried about publicly, lifted up, and worshipped too, and that with the same worship that is due to the true and living God; and therefore have they appointed a certain holiday too, which they call Corpus Christi day, wherein the sacramental bread might be annually carried about and religiously worshipped.

P. 490. Art. 29. "It being not after a carnal but spiritual manner only...that the body and blood of Christ are eaten and

drunken...it must needs be a spiritual person, not a carnal, that can eat and drink it. Though godly and spiritual men can feed on the body and blood of Christ out of the sacrament as well as in it, yet wicked and carnal men miss of the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament as well as out of it. They may indeed eat the bread which signifies the Lord, but they cannot feed upon the Lord which is signified by the bread....Wicked men do not eat the body and blood of Christ; for if they eat the body and blood of Christ, they are not wicked men, but such as dwell in Christ and have Christ dwelling in them....The grace signified by the bread and wine, &c." [See Savonarola.]

The value of the last remarks of Beveridge is very great. I have just read a very excellent modern sermon on the Lord's supper, which is clear as a bell on every other point than this one, which the bishop has here so forcibly put. A man must be godly and spiritual or he cannot receive the Lord's body and blood in a spiritual way. If then he is not godly and spiritual it is not his duty to come till he is. But this sermon blames persons for being for a long time or all their lives worshippers and not communicating. Now according to this good bishop there is a difference. All men ought to be baptized and to join in public worship that they may be moved to become godly and spiritual. But they may not come to the Lord's supper in order that they may become such; they must be godly and spiritual or they are not entitled to eat and drink at this table. Faith and repentance are required alike before adult baptism and before the Lord's supper.

(HH.) BISHOP KEN, OF WINCHESTER SCHOOL AND NEW  
COLLEGE. B. 1637. D. 1710.

The Rev. J. T. Round, B.D., of Balliol, editor of my edition, says regarding Ken's Exposition of the Church Catechism, "there being an expression in the first edition, by Beveridge, which the "papists at that time laid hold of, as if it favoured their doctrine "of transubstantiation, he took particular care in the next edition, "even in that reign" (Charles II.) "by altering the exposition to "ascertain" (make certain) "the sense." This effort is in keeping with the uprightness of a prelate, who refused to admit the Duchess of Portsmouth into his house, and brought about her dismissal from the king's dying bed, and the queen's being summoned to

attend the king instead. Ken's conscientiousness seems like that of St Paul. Instead of more eulogy I am fain to quote from his sermon on Passion Sunday a short passage singularly like the verse in his Morning Hymn, beginning "Heaven is, dear Lord, 'where'er Thou art.'" The text is Micah vii. 8, 9: and speaking on v. 8, "When I sit in darkness the Lord shall be a light unto 'me,'" he says in the person of Judah,

"My insulting enemies hinder my other friends, but cannot hinder God who is my best friend from visiting me....My chains will then be more eligible than liberty; Babylon will make me forget Sion. My very dungeon will be Heaven upon earth, when I enjoy God there....If this be captivity—by becoming a Babylonish slave to become the Lord's freeman—O may my captivity last not seventy, but seventy times seven years. No time, O Lord, is long; eternity itself is not tedious that is spent in Thy fruition. O Almighty Goodness, Thou only canst make captivity desirable. Welcome then darkness! There will I sit, desiring to see no light, but what comes from Thy countenance, for Thou art light and liberty and joy and all in all to those who for Thy sake are content for a while to sit in darkness."

The force of this passage is great, as it calls to mind the day when Ken with the primate and five other bishops went to the Tower in defence of English liberty and truth, "infinite crowds on 'their knees begging their blessing and praying for them as they 'passed out of the barge along the Tower wharf.'" Evelyn, Vol. I. 648, quoted by the Editor.

*Prose Works of Bishop Ken.* London, 1838. *Sermon on Lady Mainard.*

P. 129. "I cannot but think, upon the utmost of my observation, that she always preserved her baptismal innocence—that she never committed any one mortal sin, which put her out of the state of grace, &c. if it may be affirmed of any...by the peculiar favour of Heaven she passed from the font unsullied to her grave.

P. 131. "She never failed, on all opportunities, to approach the holy altar, &c.

P. 142. "On Whitsunday she received her viaticum, the most holy body and blood of her Saviour, and had received it again, had not her death surprised us; yet in the strength of that immortal food she was enabled to go out her journey and seemed to have a new transfusion of grace from it, &c.

This excellent bishop uttered these rhetorical representations of the blessings of the two sacraments. I do not know that his exposition of the Church Catechism ought to be deemed logically dogmatic. But on "The Supper of the Lord" he says extremely well,

"O Jesu let the propitiatory sacrifice of Thy death, which Thou didst offer on the cross for the sins of the whole world, and particularly for my sins, be ever fresh in my remembrance.

But he adds, p. 325,

"O God incarnate, how the bread and wine unchanged in their substance become Thy body and blood: after what extraordinary manner Thou who art in Heaven art present throughout the whole sacramental action to every devout receiver, &c., &c., I can by no means comprehend, &c.

There is much more, evidently most cautiously put together, as p. 327,

"Let that immortal food which in the holy eucharist Thou vouchsafest me instil into my weak and languishing soul, &c., [and] O amiable Jesu, when I devoutly receive the outward elements, as sure as I receive them, I receive Thee, I receive the pledges of Thy love to quicken mine, &c."

One seems to be perusing a new Thomas à Kempis, very much enlightened by later discoveries of the meaning of the words of our Lord and His apostle Paul. This is the part of the bishop's exposition that appears to have been carefully revised by Bishop Ken himself. Perhaps it is sufficient to say that a revising of the sermon on Lady Mainard might have brought the tone of its terms into much closer harmony with the almost universal character of the utterances of the Church of England. It is perhaps almost needless to add that the extracts from his Exposition on the Catechism all belong to his comments on the answer, "The body and blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful, &c." The passage in the first edition was "how Thou who art in Heaven art present on the altar I can by no means explain, &c." This good bishop is one of the many instances which shew that as high a devotion as that of any Puritan may coexist with terms and ideas in rhetoric that have small savour of the Reformation.

## (II.) DANIEL WHITBY, D.D. B. 1638. D. 1726.

Born at Rushden, Northamptonshire, and sent to Trinity, Oxford, of which College he became a Fellow. He found preferment near Salisbury, the Rectory of St Edmund in that city, and a canonry. He was a very voluminous writer. "The five points" were then earnestly contested: but his great work is on the New Testament. He thought for himself: and therefore his knowledge of the fathers was of great service to him. As he reached the great age of eighty-eight, one wonders why his reputation for theological learning did not float him to a higher level of church preferment.

*On the New Testament.* London, 1727.

John vi. 52. "No man who maintaineth the corporal eating of Christ's flesh to be intended here, can veritably to his opinion say that they, the Jews, imposed a *false* sense on our Saviour's words...*their* words signify no more. V. 53, 'Except ye eat, &c.' It follows plainly [on the patristic interpretations of this] that all the pious and believing Jews who heard these words and died before our Saviour's passion must of necessity be (lost)...This was said at least above a year before our Lord's passion and before the institution of that sacrament, in which alone [on these views] our Saviour's flesh could be corporeally eaten, &c. V. 54—6. The argument runs thus, *Whosoever eateth*, &c. is a true and living member of Christ's body, &c. And so no person can be wicked here or deprived of everlasting life hereafter, who in this sense...eats of the flesh and drinketh of the blood of Christ. This is very true of eating spiritually and by faith; as it imports believing on Christ. But then of [mere] sacramental eating of Christ's flesh it is as false. For this was eaten by Judas. V. 53. The eating mentioned here can never be performed unprofitably.

P. 530, vv. 61, 62. "'What and if, &c.' Are you offended that I speak of thus giving you My flesh to eat?...What then will you think of it when this body shall be removed hence to heaven? *i.e.* How will you then be scandalised and think it still more difficult and more impossible to apprehend? For Athanasius saith well, that Christ here mentioneth His ascent into Heaven that He might divert them (*ἀφελκίσση*) from the carnal sense, *τῆς σωματικῆς ἐννοίας*. Whence...we learn that Christ thought His ascension into Heaven sufficient demonstration to the Jews that *His flesh could not be eaten upon earth*, and why it should not be so to the Christian I am yet to learn...They (the Papists) give reasons

why, though they substantially eat the flesh, &c. they do this *under covert* of the accidents of bread and wine.

P. 181. "Jews thought themselves obliged to drink plentifully at their festivals four large cups of wine at their supper—to be quite drunk at the feast of Purim. Buxtorf. [See Lightfoot extracts.] On John xx. 'The doors being shut, came Jesus, &c.' Though it be an ancient opinion [See Lange's Bibelwerk] that Christ made His body penetrate through the doors, yet it is both groundless, and absurd, and contrary to the very design of Christ in coming to them. 'Tis groundless, for why might not He by His power secretly open the doors, His disciples not perceiving it, as the angel opened the prison-door and gates to let out Peter, Acts xii. 10? It is absurd: for since Christ *rose in the natural body which was crucified and lay in the grave*, philosophy informs us that such a body could not penetrate through a more solid body. And to this agree those words of Cyril of Alexandria. It is impossible that one body should go through another body without cutting it or being cut [all this is on the supposition that the ordinary laws of nature would not be needlessly suspended, as there is apparently an economy in God's miracles] and thirdly, This phansy destroys not only the end of Christ's then coming to them, but of all that *He had said and done* to convince them that *it was* the same body that was crucified that now appeared to them. [The Greek is "the doors having been shut," not "being shut:" and this is a good instance to shew that "being" does not express the sense of the pass. perf. participle.] V. 17, 'Touch me not.' Thou needest not be solicitous to touch or hold Me now. *Thou wilt have time* sufficient to converse with Me and to experiment the truth of My resurrection; for I shall not immediately ascend, &c." [but go now *at once* and tell My disciples].

(JJ.) WILLIAM CLAGGETT. B. 1646. D. 1688.

He was born at the old town of Bury St Edmund's. Emmanuel was his college. He was at first lecturer in his native town: but rose to be preacher at Gray's Inn, and Chaplain in ordinary to the King. He also held the Rectory of Farnham Royal, in Buckinghamshire. Many of his treatises were thought worthy by Bishop Edmund Gibson of being enrolled in his copious Preservative from Popery. Besides his acceptability before a congregation of benchers learned in law, he may have possessed that singularly useful gift general popularity, for he was chosen to an ordinary London lectureship. He died of small-pox. One is startled to find in the seventeenth century a writer pouring down upon the sixth of



John all the light that had been shed upon that difficult chapter, in other countries, and against which prejudice ran high in England.

*Bp. Gibson's Preservative.*

A Paraphrase with notes and preface on John vi.  
Robinson, London, 1686.

P. 28, v. 52. "'How can this man give us his flesh to eat?' The Jews disputed against Him afresh—the greater part of them taking His last words in a gross sense, as if He had promised to give them His flesh to eat with their teeth, &c. And upon this advantage, which they thought they had against Him, they exclaimed as if He had spoken absurdly, and taught His disciples to devour man's flesh.

P. 36, v. 60. "'This is an hard saying, &c.' But because He expressed Himself in this figurative, and was by many understood as if He had commended to them the eating of His flesh and drinking His blood in the literal, sense; therefore many, even of those who had sometime followed Him, talked amongst themselves as if these sayings of their Master must needs be offensive to the ears of all, &c. &c. V. 62, 'What and if ye shall see, &c. &c.' When you shall see Me ascend up to Heaven, it will not seem strange that I came down from thence; and because even then it will remain necessary that you should eat My flesh and drink My blood, you may be sure I do not mean that gross (sense of) feeding upon My flesh and drinking My blood, in which you understand what I have said, for My body will then be too far removed from the conversation of mortal men to be capable of being so used. V. 63, 'It is the Spirit that quickeneth, &c.' Now when I speak to you of the conditions of obtaining everlasting life, though I have now expressed them by eating My flesh and drinking My blood, yet you had reason to understand Me of spiritual actions...For they are such things only as feed the soul, &c. But to this purpose the flesh profiteth nothing. No: not My own flesh, if you could eat it as grossly as you understand My sayings. For even this would be but bodily nourishment, but would have no influence on the mind...The words that I speak unto you—they are those precepts of a Heavenly life and those promises of eternal life which I have laid before you."

(KK.) DR THOMAS COMBER, DEAN OF DURHAM. B. 1644. D. 1699.

A member of Sidney; born at Westerham. Wrote various works besides the unrivalled Companion to the Temple. His

character appears in the extracts from it. His works include a History of Liturgies, a Commentary on the Lord's Prayer, and a Dialogue on the right of Tythes. It is not likely that so copious a Treatise on the services in our Book of Common Prayer will ever be again attempted. It occupies very nearly seven out of eight volumes in the octavo edition of his works.

*Companion to the Temple. The Communion Service. Works. Vol. III. Oxford, 1841.*

P. 255. On the "Prayer of Consecration." "Let none therefore mistake, or *imagine we are about to sacrifice* Christ again (as the Roman Church falsely teacheth); for this is not only needless but impossible, but a plain contradiction to St Paul, who affirms that Jesus was to be offered only once, Heb. ix. 26, &c. And besides, if we think that in this sacrament Christ is daily offered up it seems we do not believe that which He did on the cross to have been sufficient, and so we should exceedingly derogate from that meritorious sacrifice, &c.; nor shall we make any difference [in this respect] between the all saving death of our Saviour and the daily offerings of Mosaic institution. Wherefore do we deny this communion to be *any new sacrifice of Christ*, &c. 'This is only a memorial which the Lord hath delivered unto us 'instead of a sacrifice.' Eusebius.

P. 257. "Surely He will make these symbols His body and blood to us. We are desirous, as much as lieth in us, to be partakers of His body and blood, and according to His command we come thus far: but we can only strike the rock; it is He must bring forth the water. We must now stand still and see the salvation of the Lord; for till He have blessed the bread and wine, we can go no further. Now if this holy rite were a mere human device, we could hardly expect so great grace and power shewed for its ratification, &c. Let us not startle at the difficulty of this sacramental change, but rest satisfied in the power of the Author and Enjoiner, &c. &c.

P. 259. "What were the words with which our Saviour blessed God, is not recorded: so that all churches have used their liberty in the manner of expressing this, &c. The Latin church, 'That thou wouldest accept and bless these gifts.' St Ambrose, 'Make this our oblation valid, reasonable and acceptable, which 'is made for a figure of the body and blood of Christ.' In the liturgy of St Basil, 'Let Thy holy Spirit come upon us, and on 'these gifts here set forth to bless and sanctify them, &c.' And, to name no more, in that called St Clement's, 'We offer to Thee, 'O Lord our King, according to His institution, this bread and 'this cup, and we beseech Thee to look graciously on these gifts 'set forth in Thy sight.'

P. 260. "Although they remain in substance what they were, &c.

P. 261. "If it may please God to make us partakers of the benefits of Christ's passion, *we will not* enquire into the manner, &c."

(LL.) BARON GODFREY WILLIAM LEIBNITZ. B. 1646. D. 1716.

President of the Berlin Academy of Sciences and Aulic  
Counsellor.

One of the greatest minds that God ever sent into this world. He was a Platonizer, as truly as Locke was an Aristotelian. His father was a professor of law and morals in Leipsic. Jena and Nuremberg have the honour of his education. But after a high appointment at court in the noble city of Mayence, he went to Paris and mastered mathematics; so that he disputed with Newton the claim to the invention of differences or fluxions, now the mighty engine of pure mathematics, and surpassed him in applying it to astronomy: but perhaps his glory rests more on metaphysics, in which he dealt with the ideas of Descartes and Locke on equal terms. But it is greatly to our advantage that he gave himself at the same time to theology. Some of his statements in it may be unsound, and many of his arguments may be plainly insufficient, and some may seem quite wrong: yet the same may be said of almost all who have dealt with these complex and delicate questions. But his "System of Theology" alone is a precious contribution to our subject, and the difficulty has been to stop quoting from it. His *Theodicæa* occupies other ground than ours. The great man who in his latter writings was delighted to honour the noble work of Locke, which in earlier days he had disparaged, deserves that we should respect him when we differ from him. And on points such as the amount of value to be assigned to "the fathers" we should hear his judgment with attention and reverence. Seldom has such a man spoken.

### *Systematic Theology.*

P. 113. "Sacraments, as a special kind of worship and sacred rites instituted by Christ, with the addition of a promise of grace.

---

*Theolog. System.* German and Latin. The Latin from Hanover State Library. Tübingen, 1860. P. 113.

Sacramenta, tanquam peculiare genus cultus, ritusque sacros a Christo, additâ gratiæ promissione, institutos. Quo tamen non pertinet

Yet the promise made to those that assemble themselves in the Lord's name does not belong to this: for this latter promise would be understood of itself even if it had not been made, for every religion demands the worship of God by men in assemblies [*i.e.* there is an instinct for assembling, and God would give a corresponding blessing even had He not promised it]. But the names of sacraments come to us as certain special institutions ... Further, there is no occasion to have a great litigation about their names: yet after the appellation of a sacrament has been received in the church, it ought to be estimated not by private liking but public use. Therefore by the name of a sacrament is at this day understood in the church, a rite to which a peculiar promise of grace has been annexed by God... Moreover of sacred rites, such as I have described, there are numbered seven... The rite in the eucharist is the prescribed use of certain signs, the grace is the nourishing of the soul or the increase of love.

P. 121. "It remains to explain our thoughts about the efficacy of sacraments '*ex opere operato*.' It is an unusual expression introduced by the scholastic writers, and it has rendered [I have changed the mode of the verb for brevity] a thing that in itself was plain and manifest to the thinker, liable to cavils and suspected of novelty. Doubtless if sacraments were so beneficial *ex opere operantis* in connexion with the work of the worker, not *ex opere operato* from the mere work done, no grace in reality would have been in any special manner added to these rites, but they would be ceremonies commanded perhaps and not to be omitted without fault, but yet not of themselves efficacious; because whatever of

*promissio facta his, qui in nomine Domini congregantur: nec enim, et si facta non esset, per se non intelligeretur; omnis enim religio postulat ut Deus in hominum cœtu colatur. Nobis autem sacramentorum nomine veniunt singularia quædam instituta... Porro de nominibus non magnopere litigandum sit, tamen postquam sacramenti appellatio in ecclesiâ recepta est, non debet a privata libidine sed usu publico æstimari. Sacramenti igitur nomine hodie in ecclesia intelligitur ritus, cui a Deo peculiaris promissio gratiæ adjecta est... Porro ritus sacri, quales definivimus, numerantur septem... In eucharistiâ ritus, symbolorum præscripta tractatio: gratia est nutritio animæ sive augmentum caritatis.*

P. 121.

Superest ut explicemus quid de efficaciâ sacramenti *ex opere operato* sit sentiendum ... Insolita appellatio, a scholasticis introducta, rem ipsam, consideranti manifestam et per se planam, cavillationibus obnoxiam et novitatis suspectam reddiderit. Nimirum, si sacramenta tantum prodessent *ex opere operantis* non *ex opere operato*, revera nulla specialiter his ritibus addita esset gratia, sed essent cæremoniæ jussæ fortasse et sine crimine non omittendæ, non tamen per se efficaces; quia

good might be in them, would equally come without them (unless prevented by being forbidden) by the mere general force of the promises, towards such as have faith and love. As therefore in the Roman civil law no obligation or pleading of agreement arose from words except after a certain form of asking and answering (that it might so be said that the efficacy of the rite consisted in the mere work being done, not in the working of the worker) so the same also could be said of baptism, as its effect is not impressed unless the essential points of the rite are observed. In the mean time that the grace of the sacrament may be received [taken up] it is necessary that the receiver's mind be in a good condition, lest an obstacle be put in the way, and so something of the work's worker (*i.e.* the state of the receiver) is a requisite to the work done.

P. 125. "I come in particular to the sacrament of the eucharist, on which the greater mass of the clouds of controversy has fallen. For some contend [defend the statement] that Christ's body and blood are not really present in the Lord's supper, but are only represented or signified in it : for that they are as far away from us as Heaven is from earth, and that whatever has the true nature of a body cannot be in more places than one. Some with greater liberty in thinking, though not in a way clear of ambiguity, seem to concede [*i.e.* Calvin, &c.] that Christ's body is really received by us, but that it is through the mind rising by faith to Heaven : and therefore since faith only is the instrument of receiving it, that the unworthy do not receive it, which seems

---

quicquid inesset boni, æque eveniret sine ipsis, (nisi obstaret prohibitio) vi generalium promissionum erga eos qui fidem et caritatem habent. Quemadmodum igitur in jure civili Romano nulla nascebatur verborum obligatio neque actio ex stipulato *nisi certâ interrogandi et respondendi formâ* (ut adeo dici posset ritûs efficaciam consistere in opere operato, *non in opere operantis*) ; ita de baptismo quoque idem dici potest, *cujus effectus non imprimitur* nisi essentialia ritus observentur. Interim, ut gratia sacramenti suscipiatur, animus suscipientis bene constitutum necesse est, ne obex ponatur ; et ita aliquid *opus operantis* (hoc est, status suscipientis) est requisitum operis operati.

P. 125.

Venio ad eucharistiæ sacramentum, in quod major certaminum moles incubuit. Quidam enim ... defendunt in cenâ Domini corpus et sanguinem Christi non adesse realiter sed tantum representari seu significari ; *tantum enim distare a nobis* quantum cælum a terrâ, nec in pluribus locis esse posse quicquid veram corporis naturam habet. Quidam liberalius (quanquam *non sine ambiguitate*) *concedere videntur* [*i.e.* Calvin, &c.] *realiter* a nobis percipi corpus Christi, *sed mente* in cælum per fidem evectâ : atque ideo, cum sola fides percipiendi instrumentum sit, non percipi sacramentum ab indignis : quod satis contrarium videtur

quite contrary to the apostle's words. But they also, when they are forced to explain their meaning, seem at length to come to this, that the mind only flows to Heaven to receive Christ's body in the way in which we are said in thought to be at Rome or Constantinople: for otherwise they will be constrained to attribute to our minds, what they deny to Christ's body; I mean the being at the same time in earth and Heaven ... The pious ancients have already acknowledged a great mystery, above the reach of the mind of man, in this sacrament: and this goes to nothing if it is a sign that is given instead of the thing.

P. 127. "As for me, if it could be shewn by indisputable arguments of necessary metaphysical force that the essence of all body consists in extension through a determinate space only, which it fills up, (since truth cannot be repugnant to truth) I must confess that one body cannot be in several places, not even by Divine power, any more than a diagonal of a square can be of the same size as one of its sides. And if that is laid down as true, we must also recur to the allegorical interpretation of the Divine word, be it written or of tradition. [If therefore the mathematical argument which follows fails, Leibnitz wholly denies that it is possible for the Lord's human body to be in two places at once.] But we are so far from any philosopher completing such a proof, of this boasted assertion, that on the contrary it seems possible to shew satisfactorily, that the nature of body requires extension, except where God sets an obstacle: and that the essence of body consists in matter and substantial form, *i.e.* in the first principle of

---

*apostoli verbis.* Verum ii quoque, cum explicare sententiam coguntur, eo tandem venire videntur ut mens non aliter in cælum evelet ad corpus Christi percipiendum, quam quomodo nos cogitatione Romæ vel Constantinopoli esse dicimur: alioqui enim menti nostræ tribuere cogentur, quod corpori Christi negant, ut simul in cælo terrâque sit ... Pia antiquitas in hoc sacramento semper magnum mysterium agnovit super humanæ mentis captum; quod sane nullum est si *pro re* signum datur.

P. 127.

Equidem si demonstrari posset invictis argumentis metaphysicæ necessitatis, omnem corporis essentiam in extensione sive spatii determinati implemento consistere, utique cum verum vero pugnare non possit, *fatendum esset* unum corpus non posse esse in pluribus locis, *ne per Divinam quidem potentiam*, non magis quam fieri potest ut diagonalis sit lateri quadrati commensurabilis. Eoque posito, utique recurrendum est ad allegoricum Divini verbi, sive scripti sive traditi [1] interpretationem. Sed tantum abest ut quisquam philosophorum jactatam illam demonstrationem absolverit ut contra potius solide ostendi posse videatur, exigere quidem naturam corporis ut extensum sit, nisi a Deo obex ponatur: essentiam tamen corporis consistere in materiâ et formâ substantiali; hoc

suffering and action : but the characteristic of substance is to be able to act and suffer. Therefore material is the prime passive power : but substantial form is the first act or the first active power ; but that these should be limited by a place of a certain [determinate] size, is indeed required by the natural order of things [in this world] but is not compelled by absolute necessity [everywhere in all possible worlds].

If one may demur, and ought to set down one's thoughts—(1) Is there not in body something more than *passio et actio*, "*pati et agere*" ? Is it not more true that *materia*, ὕλη, has these powers than that it is these powers ? (2) Extension might naturally be unlimited in free and open space ; but not where other bodies mutually press, *i.e.* the case of a true natural human body is in the *ordo rerum naturalis*, if it be talked of as in this world. Besides it is spoken of by *almost* all as a living Christ, whose body is to be in many places at once, a living organized genuine human body—and limited in extent even when glorified, which makes the supposition of unlimited extension utterly inadmissible. Notice this last the more because Bp. Thirlwall in his charge, 1866, cast blame upon the church for entering on this mathematical branch of metaphysical ground, and not only did his reasonings fail to satisfy : but the very contrary, *i.e.* the church's exact line of argument seems to me to be exactly the line of argument of our Lord in John vi. 62, "Doth this cause you to stumble," that I say ye must "eat My flesh, &c. ?" Do ye think I mean it *literally* ? What and if, Ἐὰν οὖν, ye should behold (θεωρῆτε) the Son of man going up (to Heaven) where He was before, ὅπου ἦν τὸ πρότερον ; will ye then think that real natural body *can be here too*, to be literally eaten by you ? The lines of reasoning of our church and of Christ seem to me identical. Nor do I see that Leibnitz' views on the extensibility of matter in absolute space have shaken them at all, but in respect to the bishop I annex a part of his remarks. P. 132. "It must be admitted that in the declaration or protestation at "the end of her communion service the Church of England has "deviated from her principles, has come down from her own

---

est in principio passionis et actionis : substantiæ autem est agere et pati posse. Itaque materia est prima potentia passiva ; forma autem substantialis est actus primus sive prima potentia activa ; quæ ut loco certæ magnitudinis definiantur, ordo quidem rerum naturalis postulat, non vero necessitas absoluta cogit.

“vantage-ground to that of her adversary, and has stated the question in the way most favourable to the Church of Rome; for it is made to turn on a purely metaphysical proposition as to the nature of *body*, ‘it being against the truth of Christ’s “natural body to be at one time in more places than one,” &c. This is virtually to fall into the Romish error and to stake the truth of her doctrine on the soundness of a scholastic speculation, which, as a church, she has no more right to deny than the Church of Rome to affirm. The real objection to transubstantiation is not that it is bad philosophy, but that it is philosophy; not that it is impossible, but that it is destitute and incapable of proof. [May I suggest that good can hardly spring from drawing so “hard and fast” and wide a line of separation between science and religion? It must indispose scientific persons to give religion respect. I feel that either enlightens the other, “alterius altera poscit opem et conjurat amice.” Do people think apart on science and religion? Are faculties separable into the religious branch and the scientific? Is it possible to do this? The bishop continues] “How dangerous it would be to rely on the propositions assumed [*viz.* that a natural body cannot be in many spots, loci, say one in Heaven and many on earth at the same moment], as a ground for rejecting the dogma of transubstantiation, “may appear from the defence of it which Leibnitz sets up on the “basis of his own metaphysical system,” &c., &c. as quoted above. The bishop afterwards quotes a later sentence from Leibnitz, but we read in p. 137 *molem seu potentiam resistendi*—the mass of matter and the *power* of resistance. He puts these as synonyms. Are they? Again *essentia singularis consistit in quâdam potentiâ*, The peculiar essence of anything *consists in* a certain power. Surely a power and the thing in which the power lies are not the same. We must be realists in this sense; we may refuse to speak of or to look at the something in which powers inhere, but this will not make it not be. This is the ostrich covering its eyes with its wing; but what it won’t see is there still. Again the essence of a thing *consists in* its producing the same phenomena. But enough on the modern love of mere sequences of events and their general laws. May one be excused for demurring? The other citation is from p. 139, *existentia pariter atque unio substantiæ atque accidentium realium in Dei arbitrio est*, “The only foundation “alike of the nature of existence and of the union of a substance



“and its real accidents is in the will of God.” Are we not then to assume a constancy in the laws of being? In a word I am unable to see how the Church of England loses by assuming that body is limited as to its power of presence, always according to the circumstances or circumsistent conditions in the midst of which it subsists. So when we say the natural body of Christ is gone away to Heaven where He was before, may we not say that it is not so extended in *real organization*, (whether living or not) as to be here also, and not simply here but here in tens of thousands of places at the same moment—and moreover not as the Franciscans wished by indefinite new creation of the body, but by the same body that was born, died, and was buried, and ascended, being here still? If the Church of England has done wrong in reasoning against this in words suitable to almost any philosophical system, she may defend herself by saying *erro cum Platone*, for that almost all great writers on this subject have done the same, even the testimonies cited in this volume may seem to be sufficient to shew. I wish I might give yet more space to citations from this great author in elucidation of the sacred supper. For even in laying down what we firmly believe to be erroneous foundations of a corrupt Christianity there shoot out continually sparks which illuminate and delight. I have read nothing which comes so near to another very common figure, an ocean shore, from which I have but picked up a few of its shells. I therefore add a few more passages of Leibnitz, without the Latin, to save space, and yet to present a more adequate representation of this philosophical writer and his comments on all the past history of this subject.

P. 129. “Some, admitting the real presence, defend a kind of what they call impanation [*i.e.* John of Paris]. For they say that Christ’s body is given [furnished] to us in, with, and under the bread. Therefore when Christ said, This is My body, they understand it as if any, having a sack, were to say, This is money. But the pious ancients very openly declared, that the bread is changed into Christ’s body, the wine into blood, and in this everywhere the ancients acknowledge ‘*metaschematism* or *metousiasm*’ which the Latins rightly translated transubstantiation, and it has been defined that the whole substance of the bread and wine passes into the whole substance of Christ’s body and blood. And therefore, as in other cases so in this also, Scripture is to be explained from the tradition which the church, the keeper, has transmitted down to our time. [This first principle that the clergy or

the chief clergy are the keepers and transmitters of truth to the laity is carried further, p. 145.] But whether it would be better to restore the cup to the people—*i.e.* whether the reasons do not preponderate, which so many leaders and nations have declared—that indeed it does not belong to private men to define, but to the *rulers* of the church, but most of all to the supreme Pontiff, to whom also the council of Trent left this whole business. [An exaggeration; for it left it to him to compile the catechism to parochial clergy, having itself fixed the lines of doctrine in decrees and canons. How singular that such a man should so mistake!...] In the meantime if perchance the rulers of the church should err in excess of strictness, the danger would be theirs, nor would the crime reach the subject body (subditos), for whom *it is fit to obey in those things about which the power of appointing has been given to the rulers...* The church's power indeed of defining extends wide, even to those things of a positive kind which are laid down by Divine law; as appears from the change of the Sabbath to the Lord's day [Why does Leibnitz assume that this was not done by the inspired apostles?], the permission of blood and things strangled [surely that disappeared as part of the law of Israel], the canon of the sacred books [settled by discerners of spirits and the apostles otherwise not of infallible authority, but in which churches are to be heard], the abrogation of immersion in baptism [which was only a custom and never enjoined by God; see Lightfoot], and the forbidden degrees in marriage [churches are heard, and states decide as to right].

P. 129. "In the meantime the name of bread and wine has been often assigned to the body and blood (speciebus) that remain [*i.e.* after the change], since they are not discerned by sense [how strange to call the body and blood species, *i.e.* kinds: see Dr Pusey's Doctrine of the Real Presence] as S. Ambrose said that the Lord's word was so efficacious that the things that were still are, and are converted into another thing: *i.e.* the accidents are the things which were, the substance has been changed; for he also says that after the consecration nothing else is to be believed to be there but Christ's flesh and blood. And Gelasius the Roman Pontiff suggests that bread passes into Christ's body, the nature of bread remaining, *i.e.* its qualities or accidents, for forms of speech in harmony with metaphysical notions were not then in request. And in this sense Theodoret also said that in this conversion, which he himself calls change, μεταβολή, the mystic symbols are not stripped of their proper nature.

P. 131. "Moreover it is certain that the ancients have handed down that a conversion is made by a consecration, as appears from the words of Ambrose just now quoted, &c. And indeed either the words of institution pronounced by the priest are false, far be it

to say so! or it is necessary that this which has been blessed is the body of Christ, before also its being eaten, &c. [In all this writing Leibnitz deems it a point *beyond question* that the fathers believed in a real change. I beg to commend this fact to those who spiritualise all these expressions. I have shewn that I do not think we are bound, addictos jurare, to all he said: but this strong conviction which possessed him of there being *incontrovertibly* much of the literal in such patristic sayings may surely have some weight. The whole truth, whatever it be, is surely the only safe line for Protestants, even if they have to give back many a captive father, or at least *much of what he said*, to its own side. Now just a little more about Leibnitz' philosophy in this matter]...But the accidents of the signs are not in Christ's body as in a substance (in subjecto) but *they* are sustained in no subject, and the mass itself, moles, which certainly is something different from matter [I do not see why], seems, by the Divine power, to discharge the office of a subjectum in regard to the other accidents [making the mass one accident of matter, which is I think arbitrary, confusing and groundless]. For theologians teach thus with skill (sapienter), that in worship nothing may sound amiss. For if the accidents which were those of bread could be preached to belong to Christ's body, it would follow that Christ's body is a thing easily broken, round, thin [the wafer], and whitish: it would follow also that something small, white, round, in one word, which has the properties (affectiones!), is being adored: and that things that ought not to be done or to happen to the species (elements or appearances) can happen to Christ's body itself. [Do not these words cast valuable sparks of light?] ...But since some eminent and acute spirits chiefly among the reformed, imbued with the principles of a certain new and flattering philosophy, seem, themselves, to understand clearly and distinctly, to use their own style, that a body's essence consists in extension [incorrect language], but that accidents are only modes of substance, and so that they cannot subsist without a subjectum, and are not able to be separated from their substance, any more than the uniformity of the circumference can be separated from a circle: from which conclusions arises their deplorable and all but insuperable aversion to the dogmas of the catholic church; I think I must also come to help their disease, and elaborate catholic principles, as the Lateran council ordered to be done against those who were teaching doctrines about the soul's nature that are opposed to the faith, that their objections may clearly and lucidly be satisfied and that the contrary may be accurately taught. For they cry aloud that no church's decree, no law, finally no force, can cause anything that is impossible, and implies a contradiction, or that manifestly appears to be certainly such, to be believed truly and ex animo, even if a man wishes to obey it. They

therefore 'protest' that schism is not to be imputed to them, but to those who would have them torn away and made to receive doctrines only on conditions that are impossible. [Leibnitz then speaks as if they thought Plato, Aristotle and "the Divine Thomas," nothing better than boys: but says he is afraid of being too long. Then]

P. 133. "Certainly as a place is different from a thing placed in it, or space from body, so matter is different from extension. [Granted.] But nature brings us all to this distinction that we understand something besides dimensions, which the ancients called *ἀντιρροπία*, that which strikes back a blow; we can call it the mass, moles, which is the cause of bodies not mutually penetrating into one another as if they were empty, and of their being capable of collision and mutually suffering from it, &c. [But in the next paragraph he makes this mass a power, "*potentia prima patiendi et resistendi*," and surely it is odd to confuse that in which properties qualities or accidents inhere with a *power*. Our ideas of mass are very different: and the whole seems to approach very near to confusion. In p. 137, moles is equivalent to conatus, an effort (!), but he rightly says that efforts of resistance are not "modes" of a body. The object is to shew that substance may be changed and accidents remain the same. But may we not ask if he is not explaining the essential properties of matter, and that though different from matter they are never severed from it, such as extension, power of resistance, power of motion, &c.? but this does not bring us on the way towards the possibility of so separating accidental qualities from the matter to which they belong, that for instance there may be all the sensible qualities of bread with the substance of Christ's body underneath them. I must not thus piecemeal any more, but refer to the treatise.]

P. 139. Having explained the mystery of the eucharist as far as our apprehension allows, &c. he goes on to the question of Communion under both kinds; which he says arose "because it was "more easy to lose some part of what was liquid;" so in the West the cup was withheld.

P. 143. "It cannot be deemed that the whole Christ can be taken under either kind, by the force, concomitance, to use the theologians' term...The church's rulers have done what they have done with good intention and weighty reason.

P. 147. "The adoring of the most sacred sacrament of the eucharist, though it was not always equally practised, has yet with praiseworthy piety been received. For the first Christians in all things belonging to the external demonstration of worship were simplicity itself, and this we cannot blame, since their minds were inwardly burning with true piety. But when by degrees zeal was growing cold, it was necessary to bring outward signs into use,

and to establish solemn rites, to admonish of duty and reawaken the ardour of devotion, especially where great reason or occasion for it existed. But no greater occasion can be given to Christians than that which offers itself in this Divine sacrament when God Himself shews to us the presence of the body that He assumed (for us)...Therefore the church has always used the eucharist as the token of unity, and none but the approved and cleansed were admitted to its mysteries, as to the inmost recesses of Christianity. It was not lawful for others even to be present...Hence not only was it decreed to fall down, when it was lifted up after consecration; but it was also established that it should be borne with the greatest honour even to the sick, or carried about, &c. that in a feast of its own once a year it should be worshipped as a Divine pledge on earth with the greatest church, as in a church-triumph. [Leibnitz sees nothing objectionable in all this honouring of the host. He says the elements are not adored, for their substance is changed into Christ, and Him they adore. The question is, Is it so changed?]

P. 151. "It remains to explain the sacrifice of the mass, which the church has always taught to be contained in the sacrament of the eucharist. But there is in every sacrifice both the offerer and the offering and the cause of it. But the offerer in the sacrament of the altar is the priest. And indeed Christ Himself is the high-priest Who not only once offered Himself on the cross, but also perpetually even to the consummation of the age is exercising His own sacerdotal office, and now also is offering Himself to God the Father for us, through the ministry of the priest (sacerdotis) or presbyter. Melchizedec a type, &c....But the thing offered, either [called] victim or host, is Christ Himself, Whose flesh and blood under the species of the signs goes through the office also of being sacrificed and poured forth: nor do I see what is wanting here to a true sacrifice. [Ans. There is no death, so there is no victim or host, no dying offering, Christ does not there die.]

P. 157. "Moreover, since the honour and usefulness of a perpetual or continual sacrifice is so great, it was at last received, that it should be offered to God as often as possible (creberrime) for the necessities of the faithful, even without a dispensation [for thus breaking rule]. In old time indeed all that were present at a sacrifice, were also partakers of the communion of it; but by degrees the communion was reduced to but few, from the time when, the fervour of the first piety being diminished, there began to be a proper fear lest a more frequent receiving and a promiscuous distribution should diminish the reverence and make it an occasion of sin to many...A space for preparation is given...Mixing of water, sort of bread, &c. it is for the church to order. She has power over these things."

(MM.) ARCHBISHOP FENELON, OF CAMBRAY. B. 1651. D. 1715.

François de Salignac de la Mothe Fenelon.

P. 484. "Advice for a person in cure of souls to give to his parishioners, to incline them to the holy communion. I rejoice, my very dear brethren, in the happiness, that you will this day be able to receive the greatest gift that men can receive here below. I. Although your eyes only perceive in the eucharist an appearance of bread, faith nevertheless, discovers there under this appearance the true body of Jesus Christ, that has been fastened on the cross for us. He is there with His blood shed for our salvation, with His soul, with His Divinity. He is there living, immortal, glorious, such as He is at the right hand of His Father. As Moses in Egypt changed the water into blood, and a rod into a serpent; as Jesus Christ at the marriage of Cana changed the water into wine, in the same way He changes the bread and the wine into His own body and into His own blood, immediately as the priest pronounces in His name the sacramental words. It is His Almighty Power that works this miracle, as He does all others, and they cost Him no exertion. The words of men that are sincere say that which is, but the all-powerful words of the Son of God do that which they say.... Each one of the other sacraments gives us the particular grace that is peculiar to its institution: but this gives us Jesus Christ Himself, the source of all the graces, the Author and Finisher of our faith.... Whoever should receive it with an impure conscience, in any mortal sin, instead of plunging himself in the

---

*Vol. I. 484. Paris, 1858.*

Avis d'un curé (pour un curé) à ses paroissiens pour les disposer à la sainte communion. Je me réjouis, mes très chers frères, du bonheur, que vous aurez de recevoir aujourd'hui le plus grand don que les hommes puissent recevoir ici-bas. 1. Quoique vos yeux n'aperçoivent dans l'eucharistie qu'une apparence de pain, la foi néanmoins y découvre sous cette apparence le vrai corps de Jésus-Christ, qui a été attaché sur la croix pour nous. Il y est, avec Son sang répandu pour notre salut, avec Son âme, avec Sa Divinité. Il y est vivant immortel, glorieux, tel qu'Il est à la droite de Son Père. Comme Moïse changea en Egypte l'eau en sang, et une baguette en serpent—comme Jésus-Christ changea aux noces de Cana l'eau en vin—de même Il change le pain et le vin en Son corps et en Son sang, dès que le prêtre prononce en Son nom les paroles sacramentelles. C'est Sa toute-puissance qui fait ce miracle, comme tant d'autres qui ne Lui content rien. Les paroles des hommes sincères disent ce qui est: mais les paroles toute-puissantes du Fils de Dieu font ce qu'ils disent... Chacun des autres sacrements nous donne la grace particulière qui est propre à son institution: mais celui-ci nous donne Jésus-Christ même, source de toutes les graces, Auteur et Consommateur de notre foi... Qui-conque la recevrait dans une conscience impure, avec quelque péché

fountain of the water of life, he would eat and drink his own judgment to his eternal perdition. He would give to Jesus Christ the traitorous kiss of Judas, &c....It would be useless to abstain from the communion from fear of partaking of it unworthily. In communicating unworthily one changes the bread of life into poison and one poisons one's-self; but in not communicating one deprives one's-self of the nourishment, and one leaves one's-self to die of fainting through this deprivation. We must then communicate and communicate worthily, &c., &c. When you shall have made this sacrifice [of yourself], &c. you will as an angel eat the bread of angels.

I. 435. John vi. 55, 56. "It is the flesh of Jesus Christ that we eat, but it is the spirit that quickens us. The flesh alone (*i.e.* Christ's real flesh, received) profiteth nothing, as He said of Himself. Yes: the flesh, although it be united to the Word, as S. John fears not to say, that the Word was made flesh. He has only united it [to us], to communicate to us His Spirit in a more sensible manner through this fellowship of the flesh, which He makes with us.

III. "Of the education of daughters....Strongly represent the happiness which we have of being incorporated with Christ by the eucharist. In baptism He makes us His brethren. In the eucharist He makes us His members. As He gave Himself by the incarnation to the human nature in general, He gives Himself

mortel, au lieu de se plonger dans la fontaine d'eau de vie, *boiroit et mangeroit son jugement* pour sa perte éternelle. Il donneroit à Jésus-Christ le baiser traître de Judas, &c.... Il seroit inutile de s'abstenir de la communion de peur de communier indignement. En communiant indignement on change le pain de vie en poison et on s'empoisonne soi-même; mais en ne communiant pas, on se prive de la nourriture et on se laisse mourir de défaillance dans cette privation. Il faut donc communier et communier dignement, &c., &c. Quand vous aurez fait ce sacrifice (de vous-même) &c. vous mangerez en ange le pain des anges.

I. p. 435. John vi. 55, 56.

C'est la chair de Jésus-Christ que nous mangeons, mais c'est Son Esprit qui nous vivifie. La chair seule ne profite de rien, comme Il dit de Lui-même. Oui: la chair, quoiqu'unie au Verbe, en sorte que S. Jean ne craint pas de dire que *Le Verbe est fait chair*. Il ne l'a unie que pour nous communiquer Son Esprit plus sensiblement par cette société charnelle qu'Il a faite avec nous.

### V. III.

De l'éducation des filles... Représentez fortement le bonheur que nous avons d'être incorporés à Jésus-Christ par l'eucharistie. Dans le baptême Il nous fait Ses frères. Dans l'eucharistie Il nous fait Ses membres. Comme Il s'étoit donné par l'incarnation à la nature humaine

by the eucharist (which is sequence so natural to the incarnation) to each faithful person in particular. Everything is real in the order of these mysteries. Jesus Christ gives His flesh as really as He has taken it...the quickening (life-giving) flesh of Jesus Christ. What a calamity, you will say again, to be in want of the sacrament of penitence, which supposes one has sinned since one was made a child of God. Although this altogether Heavenly power, which works on the earth and which God has put in the hands of the priests, to bind and to loose sinners according to their needs, be so great a source of pity, one must tremble for fear of abusing the gifts of God and His patience. For the body of Jesus Christ, which is the life, &c.

P. 522. "Praise the infinite wisdom of the Son of God, which has established pastors to represent Him among us, to instruct us in the knowledge of His name, to give us His body. Shew that you must rejoice that God has given such power unto men.... We must then lower the eyes and groan, as soon as one sees in them the least spot which tarnishes the brightness of their ministrings.... Their doctrine is not theirs. He that hears them hears the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. When they are assembled in the name of Jesus Christ to explain the Scriptures the Spirit speaks by them."

en général, Il se donne par l'eucharistie (qui est une suite si naturelle à l'incarnation) à chaque fidèle en particulier. Tout est réel dans la suite de ces mystères. Jésus-Christ donne Sa chair aussi réellement qu'Il l'a prise ... la chair vivifiante de Jésus-Christ, &c. Quel malheur, direz-vous encore, d'avoir besoin du sacrement de la pénitence, qui suppose qu'on a péché depuis qu'on a été fait enfant de Dieu. Quoique cette puissance toute céleste, qui s'exerce sur la terre et que Dieu a mise dans les mains des prêtres pour lier et pour délier les pécheurs selon leurs besoins, soit une si grande source de miséricorde, il faut trembler dans la crainte d'abuser des dons de Dieu et de Sa patience. Pour le corps de Jésus-Christ, qui est la vie, &c., &c.

P. 522.

Louez la sagesse infinie du Fils de Dieu qui a établi des pasteurs pour Le représenter parmi nous, pour nous instruire à Son nom, *pour nous donner Son corps...* Montrez qu'il faut se réjouir que Dieu a donné une telle puissance aux hommes.... Il faut donc baisser les yeux et gémir dès qu'on aperçoit en eux la moindre tâche qui ternit l'éclat de leurs ministères... Leur doctrine n'est pas la leur. Qui les écoute écoute Jésus-Christ même. Quand ils sont assemblés au nom de Jésus-Christ pour expliquer les Ecritures, le Saint Esprit parle par eux.



(NN.) RICHARD BAXTER. B. 1615. D. 1691.

A man, who should in such a notice as this set himself to praise the writings of this divine, might next be found proving that roses are sweet and lilies beautiful. The very mention of the Saints' Everlasting Rest, the Call to the Unconverted, and the Reformed Pastor, marks one of the greatest benefactors to the human race, if it only be granted that pure and true Christianity is the greatest blessing man can enjoy. If like Owen his genius delighted too much in hammering out its produce, till it was too thin to produce the best effect, yet who would be willing by curbing either of them to run the risk of losing any portion of their best utterances? If Dr Barrow could say of the practical writings of Baxter that they could not be mended, and of his controversial writings that they were seldom able to be confuted, who would try to add to such a dictum? He was honoured in the vain attempts to settle a general unity and conformity. He became a royal chaplain, but did not see his way to accept the offered bishopric of Hereford. But in Kidderminster he was more than bishop, and he found that God had much people there, ready to become both his reward and crown, and living examples of the healthiness of his theology. Yet it is very curious to read his views on the Lord's supper.

*Practical Works.* 4 Vols. folio. London, 1707.

P. 712. "Another pleasant holy duty is our communion with Christ and His church in the Lord's supper. This is a holy feast that is purposely provided by the King of kings for the entertainment of His family, for the refreshing of the weary and the making glad of the mournful soul. I know that to an unbelieving carnal wretch the sacrament is but a common thing, for Christ Himself and His Gospel are no better in his eyes.... We have here the communion with the blessed Trinity in the three parts of this eucharistic sacrament.... In the first part, which is the consecration, *we present to our Creator* the creatures of bread and wine, and we desire that upon our dedication, by His acceptance they *may be made* sacramentally and representatively the body and blood of Christ. In the second part of the eucharist, which is the commemoration of the sacrifice offered on the cross, we break the bread and pour forth the wine to represent the breaking of His body and the shedding of His blood for the sin of man; and we beseech the Father to be reconciled to us on His Son's account, and to accept us in His beloved and to accept all our sacrifices

through Him; so that as Christ is now in Heaven, representing His sacrifice to the Father, which He once offered on the cross for sin, so *must the minister of Christ represent and plead to the Father the same sacrifice* by way of commemoration, and such intercession as belongeth to his office. The third part of the eucharist is the offer and participation, in which the minister representing Christ doth by commission deliver His body and blood to the penitent hungry believing soul, and *with Christ is delivered a sealed pardon of all sin* and a sealed gift of life eternal; all which are received by the believer. An unbeliever knoweth not what transactions there are between the Lord and a believing soul in this ordinance, where the appearances are so small. A bit of bread and a sup of wine are indeed small matters; but so is not the communion with the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. What a comfort is it that the offended Majesty will provide the sacrifice and *that the precious*est in the whole world; that He will signify His acceptance and how He is pleased in His well-beloved Son, and *that He accepteth* His Son's intercession in the Heavens, and *His ministers' intercessions* and His church's prayers on earth, through Christ. Since Christ must be glorified with the Father and not continue visible among us, what could we desire more from Him than the threefold representation which He has left behind to supply the room of His bodily presence? even the representation of Himself by the sacrament, by His ministers, and by the Holy Ghost, which is His substitute within for the efficiency of all. [I cannot help interposing that Baxter puts the ministers forward to the view in a way not agreeable to the details of the original institution, and includes as part of the sacrament functions which do not seem to be intended to be assigned to them in any special way in this ordinance.] O what unspeakable mysteries and treasures of mercy are here presented to us in a sacrament. When you must all appear before the bar of God what would you not give for a sealed pardon, which in a sacrament is given freely now to the believing soul? [I am constrained to object that Baxter here seems to fall into what seems a common error of supposing the sacraments *seals to the person of his salvation*; whereas they are simply rich significant seals of *the general doctrine of salvation*.]...Have you the true understanding of the use of sacraments? [iv. 214.] (1) It is the *very Christ Himself*, and not only His signs, *that is given* to the believer *by means* of the signs, *i.e.* He is given, not to contact, but in right and relation, as a Head and Saviour, by contract. (2) But the signs are physically but signs still, though representatively they are the body and blood of Christ: *i.e.* It is *the very body and blood* which is represented and given by Him. (3) And the gospel covenant on God's part is the chief instrument of this right and relation *as conveyed*. (4) And the minister and the sacraments are the two subsequent instruments.

P. 139. "Consecration is the separating and sanctifying the bread and wine to this holy use, by which it ceaseth to be mere common bread, and is made sacramentally, *i.e.* by signification and by representation, the sacrificed body and blood of Christ....Some say it is done only by saying those words, 'This is My body' or (by) blessing it. It is done by all that giveth to it a separation or dedication to a holy use; and that is (1) by declaring that God commandeth and accepteth it, &c., and that we then accordingly devote it, (2) by prayer for His acceptance and blessing, (3) by pronouncing ministerially that it is now sacramentally Christ's body and blood, relatively significantly, relatively sacramentally, *i.e.* it is on those accounts so called. [P. 140.] What think you of the name sacrifice, altar and priest? It is no more improper than calling our bodies and our alms and our prayers sacrifices. [There is scriptural warrant for calling those by that name and none for so calling the sacrament.] [P. 141.] And the naming of *the table an altar* as related to representative sacrifice is no more improper than that other, Heb. xiii. 10, [a passage which] seems plainly to mean the sacramental communion. And the word 'priest' being used of all Christians that offer praise to God; it may sure as well be used of those *whose office is to be sub-intercessors between the people and God...* in subordination to Christ's priesthood." [This last phrase seems to remove all question as to this godly man not being right in his view of this sacrament. Also he loses sight of the fact that the New Testament never once applies *ιερευς*, *priest*, sacrificing priest, to any Christian minister, but only to Christ.]

(OO.) ARCHBISHOP WILLIAM WAKE. B. 1657. D. 1737.

He has been spoken of as the next primate but one after Tillotson, Tenison coming between. He was of a masculine character, but of uncertain views in relation to the reaction that had been for some time setting in towards Popery. His way of meeting it was, to say the best of it, of very doubtful excellence. His numerous writings were very acceptable in their day. There have been many editions of his little book on the fathers of the first century. But larger works also issued from his pen. He feared not to combat with Bossuet. His "State of the Church" teems with valuable historical matter regarding the English convocation. He was born at Blandford, and from Christchurch, Oxford, became preacher at Gray's Inn, and was thence advanced to St James', Westminster. The Deanery of Exeter and the

Bishopric of Lincoln were his steps to Canterbury, where he presided for twenty-one years.

This prelate's portrait would lead us to expect a decided policy. His endeavour to unite the Churches of France and England is enough to redeem the pledge; but he is also notable for the line he took on the Lord's supper. Tenison seems to have let the matter rest; but some of Wake's expressions on the subject seem to shew that he thought Dr More and others had gone too far. For (p. 46) in the Discourse of the Holy Eucharist, London, 1687, he says, "I will not deny that some men may possibly have advanced their private notions beyond what is here said." I take this to refer (among others) to Tillotson; for he defends his own position by citations from some of our highest divines, and even introduces Thorndike, and refers to Hall and Laud; but he says not a word regarding Archbishop Tillotson or of Dr More's treatise, which we have just considered. I gather from this that he thought it high time to surrender the current dogma of "a real presence of Christ's body and blood"; and with acute generalship at least to please his party and keep up their views to the utmost possible degree, he adopted the "real presence of Christ," but not the real presence of His body and blood. With this begins a new era. Here commences the Archbishop Wake period of the controversy. This view is not yet renounced. On the contrary it still retains a large body of most creditable supporters. It is therefore perhaps desirable to deal openly with it at once, even before some of this primate's actual statements are brought forward. What is then the meaning of the popular phrases of the real presence of Christ in this sacrament? It either asserts that He is present in His Godhead only, which fills all space, but that His humanity, though united to His Deity, still is in Heaven only, so that His Godhead only is in the supper with us; or else it signifies that His Godhead and His Manhood are *both* present on earth in this sacrament. Now, if the latter be the meaning, the purport is not at all different from the earlier assertion of the real presence of Christ's body and blood, in defining which the church fell into so sad and intolerable an error: so that in that case *nothing is gained* by having shortened the phrase. But if Wake meant to adopt the first alternative, that Christ's Divine presence alone is meant, and *not* the presence of His body and blood, where is the use now of the word "real"? Does any one doubt, did any *ever* doubt the reality of Christ's Divine

presence as God and as the Son of God in this sacrament? Then in this case we have a form of words that *seems* to say that there is something more than Christ's spiritual Divine presence, *i.e.* something more than the presence of Christ's Divine Spirit, and yet it does not mean any more. It is as if the term "real" (though then utterly needless) is retained just to comfort those that still hold the real presence of the body and blood, while at the same time their particular and favourite doctrine is really wholly thrown aside. There is, however, in this ambiguous wording a considerable danger of persons in general thinking that we hold a certain kind of bodily presence, or presence of the body and blood after all; and I am not without fear, nor indeed is there any room for doubt, that this is the true description of the opinions of very many in this present day. So let us weigh the Archbishop's terms.

*Discourse on the Eucharist as to Real Presence and adoration of the host.* London, 1687.

P. 43. "1. To state the notion of the real presence as held by the church of England I must observe first that our church utterly denies our Saviour's body to be so really present in the blessed sacrament as either to leave Heaven or to exist in two several places at the same time. [The certain inference is that the manhood of Christ is in Heaven *only* and is not present in this sacrament.] Again, secondly, We deny that in the sacred elements which we receive there is any other substance than that of bread and wine distributed to the communicants; which *alone* they take into their mouths and press with their teeth. In short *all* which the doctrine of our church implies by this phrase is *only* a real presence of Christ's invisible power and grace, so in and with the elements, as by the faithful receiving of them to convey spiritual and real effects to the souls of men. [The last of these sentences suits Luther's view as well as ours; but the second is in direct opposition to any and every idea of Christ's manhood being present at all on earth in this rite, on the contrary it is only His power and grace with blessed effects that are present. But come to]

P. 82, 83. "And now but one objection more ... If this be all that the Church of England understands, when it speaks of a real presence, *viz.* a real sacramental presence of Christ's body and blood in the holy signs and a real spiritual presence in the inward communion of them to the soul of every worthy receiver—will not this precipitate us into downright Zuinglianism and render us, after all our pretences, as very sacramentaries as they? [Mark the Archbishop's reply.] Indeed I am not able directly to say whether

it will or no, *because I find the opinion of Zuinglius very variously represented in this matter.* [The first is a misapprehension of Zwingel and I omit it. What Zwingel did hold is seen in this Part, but will be more abundantly seen in the Third Part when it is published.] But now secondly if he [the objector] understands by Zwinglianism such a real presence, as denies only the co-existence of Christ's natural body now in Heaven at the same time in this holy sacrament, but denies nothing of that real and spiritual communion of it which we have before mentioned; this is indeed our doctrine, nor shall we be ashamed to own it for any ill names he [*i.e.* the objector] may put upon it [*i.e.* if he call it Zwinglian]. But yet I wonder that he [the objector] should call his Zwinglianism since, if the common name of catholic or Christian doctrine be not sufficient, he might have found out a more ancient abettor of *this* real presence than Zuinglius, and the truth is, one of the most dangerous opposers of *their head and their faith* that ever was, I mean St Paul, has not clearly expressed himself against them on *this point* of the eucharist, 1 Cor. x. 16—but in most of *their other errors* left such pernicious sayings to the world as all their authority and infallibility—let me add nor all their anathemas neither—shall be able to overcome.

In this most notable passage I plainly understand this godly and enlightened primate to say that Zwingel holds the Lord's supper not only to be a sign but also a chosen way in the use of which believers may obtain much real grace from Christ's power, which is really with them in eating the bread and drinking the wine. He (the primate) does not mind if he is called a Zwinglian; for it is the true belief of the Church of England, and is real catholic truth, and was the teaching of St Paul in the First Epistle to the Corinthians. Now that there are some cloudy expressions here and there, both in the primate's writing and in his citations from his several authorities, I admit; but if the case stands on what the primate says and on what he cites, it is I think clear that Archbishop Wake, under the words "a real presence," only means the presence of Christ's Divine Spirit as Son of God, seeing that His manhood is in Heaven only.

The question arises, Why need the presence of Christ's Divine Spirit and power and grace be called a *real* presence? Did not the word "real" throughout this discussion down to the Reformation generally and almost universally mean the *res ipsa* under discussion, *viz. the body and the blood*? And did not *true* or *verum* mean *verum corpus*, the true body? And did not Dean, afterwards

Bishop Overall, mean the *res ipsa*, the *verum corpus*, when he wrote the words "The body and blood of Christ which are *verily* *and indeed* [as it were *vere et realiter*] taken and received by the "faithful in the Lord's supper"?

Therefore I ask when Wake resolved to cast overboard the real presence of the body and blood of Christ, why did he retain the ambiguous terms *real presence* at all? For all that he meant was the real presence of Christ's Godhead; and why use "real "presence" for that? It is true that Latimer in his last examination resorted to the same "trick of fence," and thought no harm of it. But experience might by this time suffice to shew us that the use of it makes many believe there is a kind of bodily presence of Christ after all. It is astonishing how men cling to old ideas. I was once gravely told that there is a difference between a bodily presence and the presence of a body.

With so express utterances by the Archbishop that he means by "the real presence" nothing but Christ's Divine power present to heal and bless and feed the faithful with grace in the Lord's supper, one might think the phrase of the Real Presence a harmless one in his hands, and one might entertain the hope that his accepting and sanctioning the mere phrase would not hurt either himself or others. But what is the fact in his case? In this very treatise pays he no penalty for retaining old received expressions in a new sense? Does not the rust of the old idea of "a real "bodily presence" cling to his newly-polished periods? Is there not some of it in the very passage I quoted last? and much more can be found in the treatise. With all respect therefore I beg to suggest to such as are inclined to this phrase—this term—that there is a danger about it. I would apologize for pressing the argument. Does it not give an advantage to the maintainers of the real bodily presence, and incline those who do not examine deeply, to think the difference between Wake's view and Popery very small, seeing the wording is so nearly identical? And do not many come to say, Well, after all there is a kind of Real Presence in the Lord's supper? I cite an eminent man from the authorities adduced in this treatise.

P. 69. "'We may not render worship to Him as present in 'the blessed sacrament *in His human nature*, without danger of 'idolatry, because He is not there according to His human nature,

'and therefore you give Divine worship to a non-ens, which must 'needs be idolatry.' [Wake adds jestingly] But still it may be he does not intend to exclude the corpus Domini, but only the corporal or natural manner of that body. Let us therefore hear how he goes on, 'For an idol is nothing in the world, saith St Paul; 'and Christ, as present by *His human nature* in the sacrament, is 'a non-ens. For it is not true. There is no such thing.' [Then Wake adds again,] What not as Christ there, no way, as to His human nature? No. 'He is (saith he) present there by His 'Divine power and His Divine blessing and the fruits of His body, 'the real effective consequents of His passion. But *for any other 'presence*, it is an idol—it is nothing in the world. We adore 'Christ in Heaven, for the Heaven must contain Him till the time 'of the restitution of all things.' [This citation is all from Jeremy Taylor, and Zwingel could have written or subscribed to every word.]

I cannot withhold one more citation. The Archbishop introduces it with a flourish as from one whom Wake's adversaries would not expect to see against them.

P. 69. "If it can any way be shewed that the church did ever pray that the flesh and blood might be substituted instead of the elements under the accidents of them, then I am content that this be accounted henceforth the sacramental presence in the eucharist. But if the church only prays that the Spirit of God coming down on the elements may make them the body and blood of Christ, so that they which receive them may be filled with the grace of His Spirit" [&c., &c., to a great length].

Thus it seems Thorndike does not believe in the presence of Christ's humanity in the supper because he thinks the church did not. We have seen that the church did believe a change of the elements, and chiefly many leading fathers, such as particularly Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria and John Damascene. But Wake clearly denies the presence of the manhood of Christ in the supper.

One word seems indispensable. If it be urged that though Christ's body is not itself present, yet is present by its union with the omnipresent Divinity of the Son of God, is not this idea at once removable by imagining a small body no larger than say half an inch in diameter inserted into a sphere as large as the sun, will that infinitely small thing be present in every part of the sun or only in the little spot where it is inserted? Just so though Christ's Divine Spirit embraces and is present in all the universe



and in Heaven at once and always; yet the little substance, His humanity, is only in one small spot in Heaven. There is no *presence* of it anywhere else. So likewise regarding the human spirit of Christ. A limited spirit is limited to one spot. God only is present in many or all places at once. And moreover Christ's human spirit must be in His human body, and therefore Christ's human spirit also "is in Heaven and not here;" and this holds, whether it be, as some think, already "glorified," or not, seeing that glorified humanity will still be limited or finite.

(PP.) BISHOP THOMAS WILSON OF THE ISLE OF MAN.

B. 1663. D. 1755.

This prelate, whose memory yet liveth among Manxmen, Governor, Deemsters, Keys, and fishermen and people in general, is a singular instance on the one hand of strength of assertion quite beyond Scripture, and therefore unwarranted; and on the other hand of excellent and moderated utterances thoroughly accordant both with the letter and spirit of the New Testament. This assertion would be strengthened could space be given to the system of Christian instruction, vol. III., which he drew up for the Indians in Georgia in consequence of what he calls "a short "but very entertaining conversation with the Hon. General Oglethorpe and others, &c." His forms of prayer for the fishermen both in church and on board the boats will interest every one. Some forty years since residing in the island I heard from the two Deemsters that the fishermen would still fall on their knees on the deck of their boats as they went out of Douglas Harbour. The bishop had also strong ideas on absolution. A sad strife about clerical power with the attorney-general of the island caused the bishop to be imprisoned many months: but by royal writ his fines, &c. were remitted. In the chief disputed case most men would think the parties guilty, and the bishop wrong. He was born at Barton in Cheshire, and was of Trinity, Dublin.

*Sacra Privata, Bp. T. Wilson's works.* Bath, 1796.

Vol. II. p. 214. Lord's Supper. "May it please Thee O God Who hast called us to this ministry, to make us *worthy to offer to Thee this sacrifice* for our own sins and for the sins of Thy people, &c., &c. [Upon placing the elements upon the altar], Vouchsafe

to receive these Thy creatures from the hands of us sinners, O Thou self-sufficient God. [Immediately after the consecration], *We offer unto Thee our King and our God this bread and this cup. We give Thee thanks for these and for all Thy mercies, beseeching Thee to send down Thy Holy Spirit, that He may make this bread the body of Thy Christ, and this cup the blood of Thy Christ; and that all we who are partakers thereof may thereby obtain remission of our sins and all other benefits of His passion. May I atone unto Thee O God by offering unto Thee the pure and unbloody sacrifice, which Thou hast ordained by Jesus Christ, &c., &c.*

A short introduction, &c. I. 7. "Two holy ordinances... Baptism by which you were admitted into the congregation of Christ's flock, were restored to the favour of God, and had the Holy Spirit communicated to you for a principle of new and spiritual life, in order to awaken you and direct that natural reason with which God has endowed all mankind... [P. 8] the other sacrament that of the Lord's supper; *by which*, upon your sincere repentance, *you may obtain* the pardon of all your past sins, and such other graces as you stand in need of, to bring you to eternal life and happiness, &c. [How much more is made of this sacrament than the Bible teaches!]

P. 18. "He did ordain this sacrament as a memorial of our redemption and of His love for us, as a pledge to assure us of it, and as an outward means and sign of *testifying as well as increasing* our love to Him. [What can be better than this?]

P. 19. "They crucified Jesus Christ, the true paschal Lamb, the very same month, the very same day of the month, and the very same hour of the day that the paschal lamb *was first ordained* to be sacrificed. [This surprises us. Yet it is a not uncommon error; for Jesus was crucified at the *third hour* (nine in the morning): and the ordinance of God for slaying the lamb was between the two evenings, *i. e.* at sunset, the beginning of the 14th day. See Thesis at the beginning of Part I.]

P. 22. "The oftener we remember it in the manner He ordained, the more graces we shall receive, &c., &c.

P. 46. "After all, this is not to encourage any person to go to the Lord's supper without a wedding garment, without a due regard to the duty. For a man may go so unworthily as to receive judgment instead of a blessing, &c., &c. On the other hand let not any well-meaning Christians be discouraged, &c., &c. A state of holiness and perfection is not to be expected at once, but by degrees, and as we make good use of the graces which the Holy Spirit from time to time vouchsafes to us—a good Christian not being one who has no inclination to sin; but one who through the grace of God immediately checks, and suffers not such inclination to grow into evil habits.

P. 119. "Three times a year!—God forbid that any good Christian should make this an excuse for receiving no oftener, if he has an opportunity! And woe to that pastor, who will not give the well-disposed part of his flock more frequent opportunities of testifying their love to Jesus Christ; of increasing their graces and securing their pardon and salvation.

P. 20. "Then the minister of God, as the steward of Christ's household, applies these blessings to every person who receives this sacrament in this devout prayer, 'The body and blood of Christ which were given and shed for thee preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.'"

(QQ.) JOHN JOHNSON, M.A., VICAR OF CRANBROOK.

B. 1662. D. 1725.

He was a learned non-juror, and employed his powers to the full in writing on the Lord's supper as a sacrifice. He also published a compilation of church laws and other works with frequent references to the fathers. His most favourite expression for the Lord's supper is "the unbloody sacrifice"; but his declarations are very antagonistic to each other, owing to the degree in which he follows up Cyril of Alexandria's views about Christ's body.

Vol. I. p. 341, A. C. Lib. "How the sacrament was consecrated of old. (1) The sacrament was by the ancients believed to be the body and blood of Christ, not by the faith of the receiver or communicant, but by the power of the Holy Ghost, or Divine benediction *imparted to it by the means of the invocation*. (2) The primitive Christians expected to receive no other body and blood than the bread and wine thus consecrated. [P. 342.] They thought the words of the institution oblation and invocation to be effectual for rendering the elements the spiritual mysterious body and blood...And indeed, if the eucharist were not the body and blood *before* distribution, it could not be made so by any post-fact of the communicants.

P. 344. "Though they believed it to be bread and wine, yet they were at the same time of opinion that they were filled with all that Divine grace and efficacy *that His natural body was*, and that if they had had His natural body and *had had stomachs and consciences to have eaten*, it could not have conveyed to them any benefit which was not as effectually conveyed to them by the eucharistical body and blood. Was His natural body anointed with the Spirit? *So was His sacramental*. Was His natural body a spiritual life-giving body? *So was His sacramental*. Was

His natural body a sacrifice for the life of man? *So was His sacramental, &c....* Nay they could not but know that if they had the very natural body, it would *have been impossible to receive it*: for neither their teeth nor their appetites would have served them.

P. 345. "If Christ be present it is so in an invisible manner; and for the natural body of Christ to be present in 10,000 places at once is impossible in the nature of things. It can therefore only be present in the imagination of men; and consequently their eating of it must be only imaginary...This is not that eating of the flesh or body that we are now speaking of.

P. 510. "Dr Claget and Dr Whitby by flesh and blood here understand doctrine, the Calvinists the natural flesh and blood of Christ.

P. 511. "If we believe our Saviour to speak of this eucharistical flesh and blood in John vi., we shall avoid all those difficulties and objections, with which the hypothesis of Dr C. and Dr W. and that of the Calvinists are pressed...John vi. The meat is the sacrament of Christ. The labour is faith. It is the wages paid us in hand: our present refreshment. It is to be given only to believers...The Jews never supposed that flesh and blood in John vi. meant one body, and the body and blood in the institution meant another. When flesh and blood are spoken of, flesh can import no more than body. I may safely challenge the greatest critic to shew any difference between them."

(RR.) FRATRES POLONI, POLISH BROTHERS.

Under this title are published in eight volumes, folio, the works of Faustus Socinus, John Crallius, John Louis Wolzogenius and Jonas Slichtingius, at Irenopolis, A.D. 1656. To these may be added the works of Samuel Przypcovius in one vol., published at Eleutheropolis, 1692. Several of them in their commentaries on the New Testament write upon the Lord's supper: nor does it seem that their statements and reasonings may not be consulted with profit, if due regard be had to the bearings of their doctrinal position in relation to the one main distinctive doctrine of Christianity. But they do not appear to be entitled to a place among the Christ-worshipping fathers and divines, whose teaching on the Lord's supper is here put together.

Faustus Socinus, born 1539, author of the Racovian Catechism, was the nephew and heir of Lælius Socinus who at their birth-

place Siena laid the foundations of their common creed. Crellius, born 1591, taught at Cracow. Wolzogen, born 1632, of Austrian parents, ministered in several places in Holland. The works of Schlichting, who was born 1596, were burnt at Warsaw, and he withdrew to Holland. Przypcov, born 1610, was driven from Poland and retired to Prussia, where he died at eighty years of age.

## THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

(A.) FROM A SUMMARY OF DOCTRINE BY PLATON METROPOLITAN OF MOSCOW, translated by R. Pinkerton, about 1700. Edinburgh, 1814.

"The Government of the church. P. 168. The duties of pastors and teachers...(2) To dispense the mysteries, &c. There is also given by our Saviour to the pastors of the Church, power to bind and to loose, or the power of the keys; which consists in this, that they can and ought, after many admonitions have failed, in the name of Christ to cut off from the communion of the church the unruly Christian or the evidently hardened sinner; and to make it known that this is *to bind*. But if such an one shall afterwards be softened by the grace of God, &c., he shall be received again into the church of Christ, and this is *to loose*.

P. 183. *Note by Editor*. "The word Liturgy in the Greek church (now) always signifies the communion service. The liturgy of S. Chrysostom is in daily use in the Russian church...the priests communicate every day. The laity seldom partake of the communion more than once a year; which is always in the great fast before Easter: but there are many of the more serious who partake oftener. The eucharist is also administered to infants, for as soon as anyone is baptized, of whatever age, he is admitted to this ordinance. The bread which is used is leavened; and it is broken or divided into small portions with great ceremony...The communicants receive the elements of both kinds standing—the bread being sopped in the cup. A little warm water is mixed with the wine, &c." P. 185. On excommunicating unfit persons, Platon quotes, like John of Jerusalem, Matt. vii. 6 "Give not, &c." P. 230, shews who err in reverencing pictures. P. 273. The Slavonian translation of the Lord's prayer has "Deliver us from 'the wicked one.'" P. 279. An appendix by the Editor is as follows. "The national church in Russia gives the general name of Raspolniks (schismatics) to all the sects which have at different times renounced her communion; but these separatists uniformly

style themselves Starovertsi (Believers of the old faith). Their origin...alterations made in the Church Service, about the middle of the 17th century in the time of the patriarch Nikon. Annals (say) schismatics 200 years before." This appendix is nevertheless very interesting, specially concerning the Duhobortsî (wrestlers with the spirit) opposed to picture-worship, whom on that account the laws call Ikonobortsî. A Russian nobleman rendered help in preparing this sketch.

(B.) PONTIFICALE ROMANUM CLEMENTIS VIII., AC URBANI VIII.,  
AUCTORITATE RECOGNITUM. VENETIIS, 1729.

This is a book of all the occasional services which a pope or bishop has to perform in the Roman Communion, such as Confirmation, conferring of Holy Orders, Ordination of Gate-keepers, Readers, Exorcists, Blessing Abbots, Abbesses, Virgins, coronations of Kings and Queens, laying first stone or consecration of churches, altars, moveable altars and all kinds of ecclesiastical furniture and personal clothing, the blessing of arms, services for Synods, excommunications, and additions to masses for the dead but not of church-bells.

*Of the ordaining of a presbyter (priest).* P. 49. "The blessing of the Almighty God and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, come down on you, that ye may be blessed in the sacerdotal order, and may offer appeasing 'hosts' for the sins and offences of the people to the Almighty God, to Whom is the honour and glory through all ages of ages. Amen.

*Of the blessing of corporals.* P. 286. "Let us pray. Most merciful Lord, Whose virtue (power) is not to be told (*ἀνεκλάλητος*), Whose mysteries are celebrated with wonderful secrets, grant, we beseech Thee, that this cloth may be made holy with the blessing of Thy propitiation, to be consecrated over that body and

*De ordinatione Presbyteri.* P. 49.

Benedictio Dei omnipotentis Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti descendat super vos, ut sitis benedicti in ordine sacerdotali, et offeratis placabiles hostias pro peccatis atque offensionibus populi omnipotenti Deo, Cui est honor et gloria per omnia sæcula sæculorum. Amen.

*De benedictione corporalium.* P. 286.

Oremus. Clementissime Domine, Cujus inenarrabilis est virtus, Cujus mysteria arcanis mirabilibus celebrantur, tribue quesumus, ut hoc linteamen Tuxæ propitiationis benedictione sanctificetur, ad conse-

blood of our God Jesus Christ Thy Son, Who liveth and reigneth with Thee, &c., &c.... Let us pray. Almighty everlasting God, deign to bless make holy and consecrate that cloth to cover and enrol the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, &c. Let us pray. Almighty God, pour the aid of Thy blessing on our hands that by our good direction this cloth may be made holy and be made by the Spirit's grace a new napkin both of the body and blood of our Redeemer, &c. &c.

*Of the consecration of an altar.* P. 242. "Let us pray that our God may bless this stone...on which the unguent of sacred anointing is poured out, to receive the vows and sacrifices of His own people, &c., that it may receive the vows of the multitude [common people] and that while we put on it the propitiation of sacred things, we may by itself have the merit of being propitiators of God, &c. &c."

crandum super illud corpus et sanguinem Dei nostri Jesu Christi Filii Tui, Qui Tecum vivit et regnat, &c., &c.... Oremus. Omnipotens sem-piterne Deus, benedicere sanctificare et consecrare digneris linteamen istud ad tegendum involvendumque corpus et sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi, &c. Oremus. Omnipotens Deus, manibus nostris opem Tuæ benedictionis infunde, ut per nostram bene directionem hoc linteamen sanctificetur et corporis et sanguinis Redemptoris nostri novum sudarium Spiritus sancti gratiâ efficiatur, &c., &c.

*De altaris consecratione.* P. 242.

Lapidem hunc ... in quo unguentum sacræ unctionis effunditur ad suscipiendum Sui populi vota et sacrificia oremus ut Dominus noster benedicat, &c., ut plebis vota suscipiat, et dum propitiationem sacrorum imponimus, ipsi propitiatores Dei esse mereamur, &c., &c.

(C.) PAUL RICAUT, CONSUL AT SMYRNA, F.R.S. D. 1700.

*Of the Greek and Armenian churches.* London, 1679.

P. 436. "So that when I consider and observe in what a plain manner our Saviour instituted this sacrament—how easily understood, and how facile to be followed and brought into imitation—for it is said, 'He took bread and blessed it and brake it and gave it to His disciples, &c.:' in like manner He took the cup and gave thanks and gave it to them saying, 'Drink you all of this.' Notwithstanding which we may see how far the churches have deviated from this easy and plain rule. The Latines administer it with a wafer and deny the cup to the laity; the Greeks give both species in a spoon together; the Armenians soak the bread in the wine. Only God has illuminated the Reformed Churches and



taught them how to follow the examples of the first institution; and yet amongst them likewise there is some difference...whereby we may judge of the malice and subtilty of the grand deceiver, who would render that salutiferous food unwholesome, and make *this principal instrument of grace and salvation* to become the most dangerous snare and ruin of human souls. [See on "Goulburn On Personal Religion."] The Armenians put no water into the wine nor leaven into the bread. Surp Usiun is the name of the Lord's supper. After baptism (with chrism) they administer unto the child the holy eucharist, which they do only by rubbing the lips with it [*i.e.* with the bread sopped in the wine]."

(D.) JEAN BAPTISTE THIERS, curé of Vib. D. 1703.

He has written several works.

*Treatise on the superstitions regarding the sacraments, according to the Scriptures, the decrees of the councils, and the sentiments of the holy fathers and of the theologians.* Vol. III. p. 25. "Protestants treat as ridiculous and superstitious all the ceremonies which the church observes in the celebration of the holy mass: but the council of Trent expresses it admirably, Canon 76, on the mass. 'Since the nature of man is such that it cannot easily without external supports be raised to meditation on Divine things, on this account our pious mother the church has established certain rites. It has also added to them ceremonies or blessings, lights, incense, robes, and many other things of that kind from apostolic discipline and tradition, by which both the majesty of so great a sacrifice is recommended, and the minds of the faithful may be excited to the contemplation of the loftiest subjects of thought by these visible signs of religion and piety.' 'If any one

---

*Traité des superstitions qui regardent les sacrements, selon l'Ecriture Sainte, les decrets des Conciles et les sentimens des saints peres et des theologues*, 4 vols. 12mo. Paris, 1740. Vol. III. c. ii. p. 25.

Les Protestants traitent de ridicules et de superstitieuses toutes les ceremonies que l'Eglise observe dans la celebration de la sainte messe; mais le concile de Trente exprime admirablement, &c. Can. 76, De Missâ, 13, &c., Cum natura hominum ea sit ut non facile queat sine adminiculis exterioribus ad rerum Divinarum meditationem sustolli, propterea pia mater ecclesia ritus quosdam instituit. Cæremonias item adhibuit aut benedictiones, *lumina, thumiamata, vestes*, aliaque id genus multa, ex apostolica disciplinâ et traditione, quo et majestas tanti sacrificii commendetur, et mentes fidelium per hæc visibilia religionis et pietatis signa ad rerum altissimarum, quæ in hoc sacrificio latent, contemplationem excitarentur. Si quis dixerit cæremonias,

shall say that the ceremonies, robes and external signs, which the catholic church uses in the celebration of masses, are provocatives of impiety rather than pious offices let him be anathema'...As the church is conducted by the Spirit of God, and according to the holy apostle's expression is the pillar and ground of the truth, the ceremonies of the mass, which it approves of and authorizes by its usages, are in no way superstitious, because she has received power from Jesus Christ her Divinæ Spouse to establish them. But with regard to those which she has not established and which are not in conformity with her practice it is beyond doubt that they savour of superfluous worship and vain obedience. [Chap. VIII.] The masses that are said for the dead, i.e. on the third, seventh, thirtieth, fortieth, sixtieth, hundredth days after their death and on the day of their anniversary, have nothing of a superstitious nature in themselves, &c. The thirty masses of St Gregory for the dead are approved of the church and are justified by divers examples. The seven masses which it is pretended were revealed to the same (saint) appear to be superstitious. The nine days of masses for the dead are condemned as a relic of paganism, not the masses said for the dead on the ninth day."

This book is designed against superstitions, &c., "avec approbation et privilege du Roi," as usual then. Registered May 14, 1711.

---

vestes, et externa signa, quibus in Missarum celebratione ecclesia catholica utitur, *irritamenta impietatis* magis quam pietatis officia, anathema esto ... Comme l'église est conduite par l'Esprit de Dieu et selon l'expression du saint apôtre elle "est la colonne et la base de la "vérité," les ceremonies de la messe, qu'elle approuve et qu'elle autorise par ses usages, ne sont nullement superstitieuses, parce qu'elle a reçu de Jesus Christ son Divin Epoux la puissance de les établir. Mais à l'égard de celles qu'elle n'a pas établies et qui ne sont pas conformées à la pratique, il est hors de doute qu'elles sentent le culte superflu et de la vaine obéissance. Chap. VIII. Les messes que l'on dit pour les defuncts : le 3, le 7, le 30, le 40, le 60, le 100 jour apres leur mort, et le jour de leur anniversaire, &c., n'ont rien de superstition en elles-mêmes, &c. Les 30 messes de St Gregoire pour les morts sont approuvées de l'église et justifiées par divers exemples. Les 7 messes pretendues revelées au même paroissent superstitieuses. Les neuvaines des messes pour les morts sont condamnées, comme un reste de Paganisme, non les messes qui se disent pour eux le neuvième jour. [Not Canon 76, but Cap. v. and Can. vii. De Sacrificio Missâ.]

(E.) DR DANIEL WATERLAND. B. 1683, D. 1740.

He never rose to higher preferment than Archdeacon of Middlesex and Canon of Windsor. He was previously Chancellor of York. He ranks as the orthodox defender of the faith in the Holy Trinity, when Clark and Hoadley had in different degrees impaired its completeness. It is true that no point is more subtle or requires greater care and prayer than a statement of the subordination of the eternal Son in position and function, but not in nature, to the eternal Father (irrespective of Christ's being inferior to the Father as touching his manhood, about which there is no doubt); and the most tolerant will, generally at least, allow or affirm that even Clark and yet more Hoadley had passed the line between orthodoxy and error. But it was not only in this that Waterland did good service. His book on the Lord's supper is considerably in advance of most of his predecessors. If one may conjecture, I fancy Albertinus was a favourite author and often in his hands. Waterland was a Lincolnshire man, born at Wasely, and went to Magdalen, Cambridge, where he became fellow and Master. He first held London preferment, St Austin and St Faith, as we strangely pervert "the holy faith"; but Twickenham is his received place of residence. His book on the Athanasian Creed is deemed good and useful, but as in many cases, the author would modify many of his statements were he living now.

*On the Eucharist.*

P. 127. "Not that I consider there is any absurdity in supposing a peculiar presence of the Holy Ghost to inanimate things any more than God's appearing in a burning bush. But there is *no proof* of the fact [of the asserted coming down of the Spirit to the bread and wine that Christ may be in it] either from direct Scripture or from that in conjunction with the reason of things. The relative holiness of the elements [as explained above, *i.e.* as in the case of the holy things under the law] is very intelligible; and as to the rest (*i.e.* the actual presence of the Spirit,) it is all more reasonably accounted for by the presence of the Holy Spirit *with worthy receivers* in the use of the symbols *than* by I know not what presence or union *with the symbols themselves*... [P. 129.] Irenæus speaks of the bread as receiving the invocation of God *and thereby* becoming more than *common* bread. Some would interpret it of prayer for the descent of the

Holy Ghost, but as I apprehend without sufficient authority. [What other sense can be given to the words, though of course a father's saying it does not bring the thing to pass or to be true?]

P. 147. "The foundation of all our privileges is our having a part in the reconciliation [by His death] which in strictness is eating and drinking His flesh and blood, S. John vi....On this is founded our mystical union with Christ's glorified body; which neither supposes nor infers any local presence... Upon the same follows the like gracious vital presence and indwelling of the other two Divine Persons, &c. [P. 148.] This orderly ranging of ideas ...may serve to shew us where the ancients or moderns have happened to exceed either in sentiment or expression, and how far they have done so, and how they were led into it... [P. 149.] It was right to apply the *general doctrine* of John vi. *to the case* of the eucharist considered as worthily received, because the *spiritual feeding, there mentioned*, is the thing signified in the eucharist, yea and performed likewise [*i.e.* in those that worthily received]. *Such application does not amount to interpreting that chapter of the eucharist.* For example the words 'Except ye eat, &c. &c.' do not mean, *directly*, that you have no life in you without the eucharist, [and yet for ages it was so interpreted, and even caused the giving the communion to such infants as could only suck the wine and not eat the bread], *but* that you have no life in you without partaking of our *Lord's passion*.

P. 202. "Some, receding from the letter, have supposed the words [This is My body, &c.] to mean This bread and wine are My body and blood *in power and effect*, or in virtue and energy; which is not much amiss, *except that* it seems to carry in it some obscure conception *either of an inherent or infused virtue* resting upon the bare elements and operating as means; which is *not* the truth of the case, &c. [This is the seventh sense in Chemnitz; and to my mind does not at all relieve us from saying the sense of Christ's words is figurative, for the bread and wine *are not* the power and effect any more than *they are* Christ's body.] It is more reasonable and more proper to say...the delivery of these symbols is...*a delivery* of the *things signified*—these outward elements imputed to us (and accepted by Him) as pledges of the natural body of our Lord, and that *this constructional intermingling*—His body and blood with ours [all this from coming out of the simple and natural use of a figure by our Lord instead of unfigurative terms addressed to the understanding only] shall be the same *in effect* with our adhering inseparably to Him, &c.

P. 212. "There is communication from God and participation by us of *Christ's crucified body* directly and of the glorified body consequently. [If this means that the natural body of Christ

is given to us to receive and take, where is Waterland as a divine to be placed ?]

P. 213. "The unworthy receiver disqualifies himself...from partaking of the thing signified...being our Lord's own body and blood. [The catechism requires guarding on this point.]

P. 238. "Cyrill (Jerus.). Receive we with all fulness of faith as the body and blood of Christ. For under the type of bread *you have His body given you* and under the type of wine you receive His blood, that so, partaking of the body and blood of Christ, *you may become flesh of His flesh and blood of His blood*; for by this means we carry Christ about with us, inasmuch as His body and blood *are distributed to our members*. The doctrine here taught is that we receive not literally but symbolically [let anyone read the directions from Cyril as to the manner in which to receive the bread and the wine and let him say if that too is to be taken not literally but symbolically] the natural body and blood of Christ; just as the priests of old in eating the sacrifices symbolically but effectually ate up the sins of the people. [How exceedingly strange !]

P. 248. "(Luther) threw off transubstantiation very justly, but yet retained I know not what corporal local presence, and therefore did not retrench enough, Zwingle threw off withal (or too much neglected) the spiritual presence and spiritual graces [on this point readers of Part III. will be able to judge. Then follow apologies made for Zwingle that he corrected his errors on second thoughts and left the low notion of naked signs and figures to the anabaptists of those times. Had Waterland read the great Swiss Reformer well, he would not have given this account of the matter], where they rested, until again revived by the Socinians who handed them down to the Remonstrants. [I have omitted the Socinian authors, thinking Waterland's citations from them sufficient. The Remonstrant church of the Dutch is more deserving of notice, but I thought my work sufficiently complete without either. Every plan has its limits. I append a few of Waterland's extracts which I translate.] Socinus. That those have grievously erred who have thought that the word commemoration or remembrance which in Greek is *ἀνάμνησις* ought to be changed into recordatio. It signifies altogether not recordatio remembrance, but communion and preaching. None would collect from that word that Christ instituted the Lord's supper for the end that it should suggest and recal to memory the death of the Lord Himself...But that communicating and preaching of the death of Christ has necessarily united to it our giving thanks to Christ. Cracovian Cat. VI. 4. 229. He that wishes to undergo this sacred rite properly, and in this way to declare the death of the Lord, must honestly and ever be mindful of

Christ's death. [P. 259. Waterland quotes with much approval Mr Bradford.] It is evident that neither the body broken nor the blood shed neither do nor can really exist [true of the latter I suppose]: they neither can be really present nor literally eaten or drank: nor can we *really receive them*, but only the benefits purchased by them. But the body which now exists, whereof we partake, and to which we are united, is the glorified body, which is therefore *verily and indeed received* [how can that be in the sense here meant, if it be in heaven and not here, &c.?), and *consequently said to be really present*, notwithstanding its local absence. [Will not plain laymen say that we are mad?]

P. 261. "In the holy eucharist the sacrament is physically present, the *res sacramenti* *morally so*, the elements antecedently and locally. The very body consequently and virtually: but both really present. [I can compare this to nothing but the buzzing of an infatuated moth round the flame of a candle till at last it flies right in and burns its wings. See Wake, after seeing Tillotson.] We do not hold that we barely receive the effects and benefits of Christ's body; but we hold 'it' *really present* inasmuch as it is really received. [Waterland says "The account is just." Compare the extracts from John Bradford.]

*The Christian sacrifice explained. A Charge. 1738. Works, VIII. Oxford, 1823.*

P. 147. "A question was...raised among us about an hundred years ago, whether the material elements of the eucharist were properly the Christian sacrifice. At the beginning of this present century the same question was again brought up, and it is not altogether extinct even at this day...owing to some confusion of ideas or ambiguity of terms, &c. How that confusion arose may perhaps be learned by looking back as far as to Bellarmine about 1590, or...as far as the Council of Trent about 30 years earlier. Before that time things were much clearer so far as concerned this article. Nobody almost doubted that...spiritual sacrifice was *true and proper* sacrifice, yea the *most proper* of any.

P. 149. "The custom of Christian language not only in the New Testament but also in the church-writers has run on the side of spiritual sacrifice, &c. A sacrifice is properly anything performed for God's due and sole honour in order to appease Him...This notion of sacrifice prevailed in that century, the fourth, in the time of Aquinas, and in the centuries following, and was admitted by the early reformers and even by Romanists also as low as the year 1556, or yet lower. [P. 150.] So that spiritual sacrifice was not yet entirely excluded as *improper, metaphorical, and nominal* among the Romanists themselves: neither was it a rule that a *material* thing was essential to the nature, notion,

or definition of *true* and proper sacrifice... The Romanists... thought of this pretence...that either their mass must be the sacrifice or the church really had none, &c.; the Protestants... would be left without a sacrifice, &c. and be no longer a church... The Protestants had two very just answers...First, Christ Himself was the church's sacrifice, &c. The second, they had...sacrifices of their own to offer...prayers, praises, &c. The Council of Trent endeavoured to obviate both these answers, and Bellarmine undertook formally to confute them...

P. 174. "Luther first took notice of the self-contradiction contained in making the elements a proper sacrifice to God in the eucharist. On abrogating the Mass, II. Pt. ii. 255. While we make a sacrifice of our bodies and our praises to God, we give all to God alone, so that the scheme of sacrifice, stands though it be *spiritual*...(But) neither do we offer (the elements) if we eat them; nor do we eat if we offer...Let Louvain and Paris solve this difficulty if they can. [Waterland says several schemes have been thought on, to elude this argument, by Romanists and others: but it is impossible to invent any that will bear. See also Bishop Van Mildert's life of him, p. 215, &c. and p. 264, &c.]

*Appendix, c. III. p. 194.* "It is pretended that our blessed Lord offered up His sacramental body, *i.e.* the consecrated elements, *as a material sacrifice* in the eucharist. Johnson, Pt. I. Now in the first place I find no Scripture proof of this position. The Romanists in support of the *general* point of a material and sensible sacrifice have often taken their tour from Melchizedek in Genesis down to Hebrews xiii. 10. And they have as often been pursued by the best learned Protestants, and forced out of all their entrenchments. The note gives a list of sixteen beginning with Chemnitius. The plea from 'Do this' when first set up was abundantly answered by a very learned Romanist: I mean the excellent Pickerell, who wrote about 1562 and died in 1590. Protestants also have often confuted it...The other boasted plea, drawn from the use of the *present tense* [which is given, &c. which is shed] has been...often refuted and exposed, &c.

P. 196. "It is certainly of some moment that so learned and judicious a man as Pickerellus, &c. should so expressly and freely declare *against* our Lord's offering any expiatory sacrifice in the eucharist. It is also of some moment that the current opinion before the council of Trent was against the first eucharist's [the institution's] being an expiatory sacrifice, and that the divines of Trent were almost equally divided upon that question, &c. Jansenius, Bishop of Ghent...was content to take in spiritual sacrifice...to make out some sacrifice in the first eucharist.

P. 197. "No proof has been given nor ever can be given of our Lord sacrificing the elements. He might, yea and did

offer the elements for consecration (which is very different from *sacrificing*, &c.), or He might present them as signs and figures of a real sacrifice, being also signs and figures of real body and blood: but *as they were not* the real body and blood which they represented, *so neither were they the real sacrifice*, neither can it be made appear *that they were any sacrifice at all*...Want of proof is sufficient reason for rejecting a position, according to the old rule that the proof lies upon him who affirms. However, I may, *ex abundante*, throw in one reason against it which may be as good as a thousand, because it is decisive, If the elements were a sacrifice in the first eucharist...then they were given for remission of sins, consequently were a sin-offering and an expiatory sacrifice, which is directly repugnant to the whole tenor of the New Testament, every where ascribing *true* expiation solely to the death of Christ."

(F.) BISHOP BENJAMIN HOADLEY OF WINCHESTER.

B. 1676. D. 1761.

A native of Kent. From Catherine Hall, of which he had become fellow and tutor, he passed through some London appointments to the vicarage of Streatham. From that he passed through three bishoprics, Bangor, Hereford, and Salisbury, to his final position, in which he lived for 26 years. He probably owed his preferments to the extreme freedom of his opinions, on account of which he was repeatedly challenged. But the one point that is pertinent to this subject is, that to him belongs the unenviable singularity among moderns, of we will not say denying, but of ignoring the spiritual and personal benefit of the Lord's supper. Of all the writers whom I have included, he alone of the later centuries, as Pelagius alone in the earlier, made the Lord's supper *a mere commemoration*, and did not, as far as I see, hold it out as an eminent way of obtaining spiritual blessing. Perhaps no writer lays more stress upon and more develops the idea of commemoration than old Dr Lightfoot: but then see what strong and large utterance he also gives to his persuasion of the spiritual benefit to be found in the use of it both in communion with God by Christ, and with one another in Christ. Modern orthodox nonconformists appear to me decidedly clear on this point; and not a few of the Arian and Socinian writers accord in a greater degree with the general church on this important subject: *viz.* that we ought to find great spiritual aid and joy in the use of



the supper. It would please me much could Hoadley be shewn to be partially clear of this charge. Had we all the writings of Pelagius perhaps he might come off better than he now appears.

*Plain account of the nature and end of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.* London, 1735.

P. 25. "The end of this institution was the remembrance of Christ. It must follow from hence that to eat and drink in the Lord's supper must be to eat and drink in a sense consistent with the notion of this remembrance; and therefore that to substitute or teach that Christians eat His real and natural body in remembrance of His real material body, and drink His real blood in remembrance of His real natural blood, is to teach that they are to do something in order to remember Him, which supposes Him corporally present; and destroys the very notion of that remembrance, and so directly contradicts the most important words of the institution...Add to this that St Paul...concludes that as often as Christians eat this bread and drink this cup, they—he does not say feed upon Him corporally present, but the contrary—shew or tell forth His death, till He come, *i.e.* until the time that He shall be corporally present with them. This strongly implies the belief of His bodily absence to be even necessary to that duty, and that *His bodily presence is utterly inconsistent with it*, and, whenever it shall be, will put an end to a rite instituted only for the remembrance of Him in His absence. They therefore who require Christians to believe that they feed in the Lord's supper on Christ's natural body present, do in effect forbid them to eat this bread in remembrance of His body. The same may be said of the doctrine...of a real sacrifice of Christ's body offered by the priest...*viz.* that it contradicts the very words of the institution, in which the remembrance of an absent body broken, not the offering of a present body, is declared to be the end of this religious action.

P. 27. "Nothing can be eaten or drunken in remembrance of itself...*Body and Blood of Christ. Misstaters of Bp. Hoadley.*  
P. 44. It was not the apostle's design to speak of the benefits accruing to communicants...but only of the significance of this rite, as an act of religious honour paid by Christians to their Master...(2) P. 40. In honour to Him as the Head of that body, of which we are all members, the only sense in which the communion and Jesus partaking can be understood. (3) P. 104. Copious summary with nothing about feeding on Christ: declaration of His death, and p. 111. P. 153, a less defective one. P. 34. 'The bread which we break, &c.' Though St Paul goes on to prove Christians to be one body from the social partaking

of one and the same bread, yet *in this particular verse* the body of Christ no more signifies that society than the blood of Christ does...P. 45. We see the word *κοινωνοὶ* used with regard to idols, where no spiritual part (eating) could be thought of...and yet he forbids them to communicate with the worshippers of them. P. 47. St Paul found occasion to speak...of sacrifices made to idols, and of the altar in the Jewish temple, yet when he comes to speak of the Lord's supper, he *does not represent the bread and wine as things offered in sacrifice to God* upon an altar, nor of any altar, nor of any offering of bread and wine nor of any sacrifice made to God as upon an altar, but *in the plainest words* the cup of the Lord and the table of the Lord...P. 54. The only person who answers to a *Jewish priest*, considered as a sacrificer, is Jesus Christ Himself Who offered Himself up. The only thing that answers to *the altar*, upon which the sacrifices were offered, is that very cross upon which Christ died...P. 55. Many of the fathers and commentators who lived some hundreds of years after the institution of the Lord's supper, *when by degrees the language had been altered*, though themselves, among other high words, often called the rite a sacrifice, yet would they not forbear sometimes to correct the expression and declare they did not mean a sacrifice properly speaking, but only the remembrance of a sacrifice, particularly Chrysostom, Hom. xvii. Ep. to Heb. He had said *θυσίαν ποιούμεν* (we perform a sacrifice). He adds *μᾶλλον δὲ ἀνάμνησιν ἐργαζόμεθα θυσίας* (but rather we are working to effect a remembrance of a sacrifice). [What a grievous injury it has proved to subsequent ages that they did not recast the whole of their perilous expressions !]

P. 60. 1 Cor. xi. 22. "Have ye not houses, of your own, for your ordinary eating and drinking? Or have ye no sense that these assemblies of Christians come together for the religious purpose of eating and drinking in remembrance of their Master, and that the place where they meet for this good end, is not the proper place for your ordinary meals, much less for your excesses in eating and drinking? Do ye thus despise the Church of God, the assemblies of Christians and the place you at this time profess to meet in for religious and not for common purposes?...This passage argues that whatever place they agreed to meet in (though often changed) that this place I say *at the time of the assembling in it* for an act of religion was not a proper place for the ordinary meal.

P. 67. "'Not discerning &c.,' not making a sufficient difference between the bread eaten at the Lord's supper in memory of Him, and a common meal even intemperately taken.

P. 66. "The word rendered 'examine himself' signifies the approving after trial and examination regarding the institution

and design of the Lord's supper, and let him eat and drink 'so,' *i.e.* in such a manner as becomes that design.

P. 75. "Nor does it in the least imply that Christians may not wisely choose to spend a longer time in religious consideration and prayer...but we are not to confound duties and make that peculiar to the holy communion which was never made peculiar by Christ or His apostles, which is proper to every season and would have been equally a duty whether it had pleased the Lord to institute the communion or not.

P. 96. "Heb. xiii. 10. 'We have an altar, &c.' As not one commentator ancient or modern of great note interprets this obscure passage of the Lord's table, so there is not one good reason for such an interpretation.

P. 99. "'Partaking of the benefits of Christ's death.'

P. 148. Catechism. "'Verily and indeed taken and received,' very figurative, *where a figure ought not to have been made use of.*"

## THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

(A.) BISHOP THOMAS TURTON, OF ELY. B. 1780. D. 1864.

MANY think him to have been an equally successful champion when he took lance against Lord Brougham respecting the English universities, and when his opponent was that extremely sagacious cardinal and man of the world (if such a term may be excused, since Bp. Hall says, we ought not only to be *viri Dei*, but also *viri seculi*), I mean that acute Papal controversialist, whom with Dr Pusey I reserve for the Third Part of this work, Cardinal Wiseman. In the main line of his argument and in many of his details Dr Turton would be conceived by us to be entirely successful. But perhaps one of his most valuable details is his maintaining that, in John vi., ἀληθής, as well as ἀληθινός, signifies antitypical, the ideal of the typical forms. "My flesh is true food (βρώσις) and My blood is true drink, πόσις." Had this text to be given up to those who hold the presence of Christ's natural body in the Lord's supper, our argumentation would be undermined to a serious extent; for God's word would not be entirely on our side. But one of the instances of Dr Turton is thoroughly convincing, "Behold an Israelite indeed, ἀληθῶς, in whom is no guile." There can be no doubt as to the meaning of ἀληθῶς in the passage in question.

*The Roman Catholic Doctrine of the Eucharist, in reply to Dr Wiseman. Cambridge, 1837.*

P. 19. Tittmann says, "Profane writers...use 'to eat and to drink' of being imbued with the doctrine of any one, &c. But that they so used the phrases 'to eat the flesh of any one and 'to drink the blood of any one' cannot be proved by a single example. These forms of expression were clearly unheard of by

any author, and are peculiar to our Lord alone. Therefore can we no wise appeal to their custom of speech. (P. 273, Comm. St John.)

P. 193. [We now have here a notable mode of speaking.] "To eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ, which is beyond question equivalent to that in v. 5, 'to eat bread,' or 'to eat Jesus' as 'the bread of life.' For the same power is ascribed to each, that is to say 'he shall not die,' 'he shall live for ever,' and 'he hath eternal life.'

In p. 276. "But there seems not any further doubt with our (divines), nor can there be with any learned man, that the Lord in this place by no means looked back to the rite of the sacred supper [the Passover] nor so spake concerning sacramental eating (to use the terms of dogmatic discussions) but rather concerning spiritual eating. For the whole passage is allegorical and for this reason it cannot be received in any other manner in this part of it (hic). [Tittmann, translated for this book.]

P. 198 (Turton). In John i. 47. "When Jesus saw Nathaniel approaching, He said 'Behold an Israelite indeed,' ἀληθῶς Ἰσραηλῆτης, in whom is no guile.' Can anyone imagine that our Lord then adverted to the *unblemished descent* of Nathaniel from the ancient patriarch? Alas! 'they are not all Israel' (truly) 'that are of Israel.' He undoubtedly spoke of his possessing qualities (implied in the term ἀληθῶς) which rendered him worthy of his lineage. The word ἀληθῶς is similarly employed John viii. 31. Then said Jesus to the Jews that believed on Him, 'If 'you continue in My word then are ye my disciples indeed,' ἀληθῶς. [There seems to me a great difference between these two cases. The latter ἀληθῶς is opposed to "in pretence," and means ye will have good claim to be called disciples. The former instance is an Israelite not in descent after the flesh, but in that antitypical excellence, of which Israelites are a type, *i.e.* God's spiritual children, just as Christ says, John vi., "My flesh is *true* meat, ἀληθῆς βρώσις, and My blood is true drink, ἀληθῆς πόσις," that spiritual refreshment of which "food" and "drink" are *types*.]

P. 199. "Any person bearing in mind our Lord's method of addressing His hearers would at once infer that some figurative meaning was intended. It is spiritual food to be spiritually received. It is Christ Himself Who is *thus* intended. No wonder that He should be called the true bread, ὁ ἀληθινός. [It will be perceived that Dr Turton thinks ἀληθῶς used in Nathanael's case at least as equivalent in sense to ἀληθινός. He does not restrict the *higher sense* to the latter form.]

P. 201. "We now pass to the last portion of our Lord's reply, v. 58. After having mentioned first His flesh and blood, and then

Himself as the food, &c. He connected the subject with all that He had before declared concerning 'the bread from Heaven.' 'This is the bread which cometh down from Heaven, &c.'

P. 203. "If there be a person who, after weighing all this, can for a moment hesitate to admit that the eating and drinking spoken of throughout this discourse is entirely spiritual, such a person is in my opinion not to be convinced that any part of Scripture is to be spiritually understood.

P. 235. "My object has been to shew that the debateable part of the chapter is to be understood spiritually as well as the remainder. That part (the debateable) may be understood sacramentally likewise, without any supposed transfer of natural properties (bread into flesh)."

(B.) THE REV. W. PALMER OF WORCESTER, OXFORD.

*Antiquities of English Ritual.* Vol. II. Oxford, 1836.

*On the Holy Communion*, p. 134. "The immediate or proper form of consecration [in the Church of England] follows the preface and begins, 'Hear us, O merciful Father.' First the ἐπίκλησις [invocation of the Spirit] itself. (2) The commemoration of our Lord's deeds and words...In all the ancient liturgies and in all the writings of the fathers we find memorials and traces of some prayer in which...God was requested to confer...the benefits that the faithful might be partakers of the body and blood of Christ...In the East and much in the West the Church supplicated God *to send down the Holy Spirit*, Κατάπεμψον τὸ Πνεῦμά σου τὸ ἅγιον ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα. Ποίησον τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον τίμιον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, μεταβαλὼν τῷ Πνεύματί σου τῷ ἁγίῳ. [Eng. Send down thy Holy Spirit on us and on the gifts lying before Thee. Make this bread the precious body of Thy Christ, having effected the exchange by Thy Holy Spirit.] Roman, Hanc igitur oblationem servitutis nostræ &c. ut placatus accipias, &c. quam oblationem, &c. benedictam, acceptabilemque facere digneris ut nobis corpus et sanguis fiat, &c. [That Thou wouldst be appeased and receive this oblation of our submission—which oblation mayest Thou deign to make blessed and acceptable that it may become to us the body and blood, &c.] ...In Cæsarea, Antioch, Alexandria a direct invocation as in Constantinople. The African used invocation of the Holy Ghost as Spain...No doubt as to Gallican...*But not essential*, (1) never used in Italy and the apostolic church of Rome, (2) not necessary to mention *the means*, &c. to accomplish the end prayed for. No trace of prayer for the Holy Ghost in any liturgies of Milan, Italy

and Rome. The *petition in the Church of England* 'that we may 'be partakers of His most blessed body and blood in receiving 'these Thy creatures of bread and wine' not *necessarily* referred to the sacramental participation...yet made to refer directly to it by the words of limitation.

P. 140. "This prayer does not expressly mention the consecration of the elements—nevertheless in effect a prayer for their consecration—for *it is necessary* that consecration should take place before...In fact the omission is analogous to the omission of a direct prayer for the Holy Ghost in the ancient Roman and Italian liturgies. If it be granted that the Roman form is a valid prayer for consecration though it does not speak of the means (*i.e.* the Holy Ghost) it must be granted that the English *is a valid form* for partaking of Christ's body and blood in a sacramental manner, and *therefore for the consecration* [which alone renders this *possible*] though *the consecration itself is not spoken of.*" [Much ingenuity requisite here. Is the point that is aimed at proved? Is it not in one part surrendered and in the other part not established? If so is it correct to entitle this prayer "a prayer "of consecration"? Ought it not to have been termed "a prayer at the consecrating, which takes place by the act of the laying on of hands"?]

(C.) JOHN ADAM MOEHLER, PROFESSOR AT MUNICH, DEAN OF WURTZBURG. D. 1838.

*Symbolism. The differences betwn. Cath. and Prot. Trans.* London, 1843. First Edition, Tübingen, 1832. Fifth Edition, Munich, 1838.

Vol. I. p. 286. "A sacrament is defined by the Cat. ad Parochos to be an outward sign which in virtue of the Divine ordinance not only typifies *but works* the supersensual, to wit, holiness and justice. (1) A sensual part (in religion), (2) pledges or sureties of the Divine will, (3) channels (quasi alvei) whereby the power that flows from the sufferings of Christ... is applied to each one... that the soul may be reestablished or confirmed, (4) outward marks of confession, (5) as man had ignominiously delivered himself over to the dominion of this lower world he needs *its* mediation to enable him to rise above it.

P. 388. "As regards the mode in which the sacraments *confer on us* sanctifying grace, they work *ex opere operato, i.e.* convey a Divine power merited for us by Christ ... conferred by God *through their means*. Man must receive—be susceptible of it [Note, these are very different. "Must receive" is what is in analogy with the Bodily Presence Scheme; and most divines who

teach that insist on this]—evinced in repentance and sorrow for sin, desire of a Divine aid and in a confiding faith. [Note. But what if the communicant do *not* evince all this? he must still have the blessing since the sacrament is performed, *opus operatum est.*] By this doctrine the objectivity of Divine grace is upheld [Note. *I.e.* it is as it were tangible, not secret, unseen and subjective], and we are prevented from drawing down the effects of the sacrament into the region of subjectivity, and from entertaining the opinion that these (the benefits of the sacraments) consist in mere moral ... feelings, considerations and resolves—as at the view of a picture—at the moment of receiving or (before). This except in the case of infants *is necessary*; but *it is not* the Divine grace promised, nor doth it *even* merit it. Now the religious energies of the soul are set in new motion by the sacrament, since *its Divine matter impregnates* the soul—vivifies it anew—establishes it in the most intimate communion with God ... within all who do not shew themselves incapable of its graces, or do not place an obstacle in its way. (From Council of Trent Catechism, Hugh S. Victor, Hales, Buonaventura and Thomas Aquinas.) [Note. But how is it as Latimer says concerning treating the supper as a sacrifice, that none of the apostles has told us one word about all this?]

P. 334. “Almighty God is pleased to change the inward substance of the consecrated bread into the body and blood of Christ. We *therefore adore* the Saviour mysteriously present ... The mass proved to be in experience in the second and third centuries ... *The church* is the living figure of Christ manifesting Himself and working through all ages, whose atoning and redeeming acts it, in consequence, *eternally repeats* and uninterruptedly continues. He is eternally living in the church. In baptism He perpetually receives ... in penance He pardons; He strengthens in confirmation; breathes into the bridegroom and the bride higher conceptions, &c.; unites Himself most intimately with all who sigh for eternal life under the forms of bread and wine; consoles the dying in extreme unction; and in holy orders institutes *the organs* whereby He worketh all this.

P. 337. “We here [in this sacrament] find the whole scheme of redemption reflected. Without it [the sacrament] the other parts (of His great work) *could not have sufficed* for our complete atonement. Hence the sacramental sacrifice is the true sacrifice... [*i.e.* as well as the sacrifice on the cross]. In the Christian worship He is the *universal* victim. *Here* is the victim for us, *in particular*: for each individual among us. The belief in the real presence forms the basis. Without that the solemnity is a mere reminiscence. The sacrifice presented merits internal grace. The mass is a living representation of infinite love. [Note. Thus in this most philosophical of all modern papal writers the presence of



Christ's body is essential to all blessings: and be it noted that he uses the words "The real presence" as quite sufficient to describe it.]

P. 347. "If such great and living manifestations, &c., be unable thoroughly to purify the heart, we may reasonably despair and abandon ourselves to a mere theory of imputation. [Note. What is this but a theory? Also observe how he said before that all blessings are wrought by this real presence unless ... a man puts an obstacle in its way. Who does not put many? But Christ's doctrine is, Though your sins be as scarlet, &c., &c. Come unto Me, &c.]

P. 351. "In the doctrine of transubstantiation Christianity with its entire essence exhibits itself as an external immediate Divine revelation. At the period of the Reformation therefore it was the more necessary to bring out this doctrine and the ecclesiastical rites connected with it in the most prominent form, as an empty erroneous spirituality was everywhere manifesting itself.

P. 353. "Luther taught a real and substantial presence [*i.e.* of the body] without transubstantiation. Zwingle that 'is' means 'signifies.' Œcolampadius that 'My body' signifies 'the sign of 'My body.'

P. 356. "Calvin that the material elements merely signified the body and blood of Christ—a power emanating *from the body of Christ*, which is now in Heaven only, is committed to the Spirit.

P. 358. "Melancthon after the Augsburg Confession changed it thus: It was 'De cœnâ Domini docent quod corpus et sanguis 'Christi *vere adsint*, et distribuuntur vescentibus in cœna Domini, 'et improbant secus docentes.' [In English, The Protestants teach concerning the Lord's supper that the body and blood of Christ are *truly present*, and are distributed to those who feed in (*i.e.* eat) the supper of the Lord, and they disallow those that teach otherwise.] He made it 'De cœnâ Domini docent quod cum pane et 'vino *vere exhibeantur* corpus et sanguis Domini vescentibus in 'cœnâ Domini.' [In English, They teach concerning the supper of the Lord that together with the bread and wine are *truly furnished* or *exhibited* the body and blood of the Lord to them that eat in the Lord's supper.]

P. 360. "Beza at the religious colloquy at Poissy declared that Christ [Christ's body] was as far removed from the eucharist as Heaven is from earth ... The orthodox Luther decreed in the Formulary of Concord that the body of Christ is administered in with or under the bread." [As to the authorship of the Formulary of Concord see the details under the name of Martin Chemnitz in this volume. Hagenbach says that Möhler took light from the

freethinkers of Germany, and “strove to amend or idealize “Roman Catholic doctrine’.” So in citing Möhler we produce its most favourable witness.]

(D.) EUGENE HAAG. FL. 1862.

Auteur de *La France Protestante*, 2 tomes 1860, also of *Les Conciles Premiers*.

*Christian dogmas.* I. 223. “From a very early age the bread and the wine, signs of Christ’s body and blood, were the objects with them of a profound veneration. They generally believed that Christ’s body and blood were given and received in the supper. They used to attribute magical effects (see Neander, Cent. IV.) to the bread and wine, because they were convinced that the Logos was united to it. But they were by no means agreed on the manner in which this union came to pass. With reference to this their ideas long remained obscure and confused, as we shall shew by numbers of citations from the fathers...If one had asked the most ancient fathers of the church “Is the bread in the eucharist “Christ’s body?” they would have certainly answered in the affirmative. But if one had put the question in these terms, “Is the “bread transubstantiated? Is its substance changed into the substance of Christ’s body?” they would have assuredly denied it. [I think this chain of ideas might have had another link or two—thus, had they then been put to the question “What is there of

*Histoire des dogmes Chrétiens.* 2 tomes. 2me Editn. Paris, 1862, I. 223.

De très bonne heure le pain et le vin, symboles du corps et du sang de Christ, furent pour eux l’objet d’une profonde vénération. On croyait généralement que le corps et le sang de Christ sont donnés et reçus dans la Cène. On attribuait des effets magiques au pain et au vin, parce qu’on était convaincu que le Logos y était uni; mais on n’était nullement d’accord sur la manière dont cette union s’opérait. A cet égard les idées restèrent longtemps obscures et confuses, comme nous le montrerons par des nombreuses citations des pères... Si l’on avait demandé aux plus anciens docteurs de l’église, “Le pain eucharistique est-il le corps du Christ?” ils auraient certainement répondu “d’une manière affirmative. Mais si l’on avait posé la question en ces termes, “Le pain est-il transubstantié? Sa substance s’est-elle changée “en la substance du corps du Christ?” ils auraient assurément nié...

<sup>1</sup> Hist. Doct. II. In Hist. Christian Ch. Vol. II. he says, “Who became to the “(R.) Cath. Ch. what Schleiermacher was to the Protestant and appropriated much “from him. (He studied under him), Schelling and Hegel and applied it to “(R.) Catholic purposes.” See Symbolism: and Lives of Athanasius and Anselm.

"Christ's body there, seeing that the only appearances are made of "bread and wine?" some would have said "I believe that *both the substances* are there," others, anticipating the fourth Lateran, would have said "No, only one; and that is the substance of "Christ's body." Hardly any would have said that the substance and the qualities of both were there, only that the qualities or properties of Christ's body were concealed.]... Meanwhile with time and above all the series of controversies on the person of Jesus Christ, ideas became cleared and precise; the doctrine of an expiatory sacrifice offered by the priest, after the pattern of the Jewish priests, spread more and more and with it ideas more and more favourable to transubstantiation; so that the seventh ecumenical [general] council held at Nicæa in 787, met with an almost unanimous approbation, when it proclaimed that, after the consecrations, the bread and the wine are no longer figures, but truly the body and blood of Christ, as Mansi (recites) in his history of the Councils, XIII. 266. 'Neither our Lord nor the apostles or 'fathers called the unbloody sacrifice which is offered by the priest 'a similitude (figure) but very flesh and very blood (flesh itself 'and blood itself). For before the consecration some of the 'fathers piously judged that they should be named figures of the 'things to be accomplished (lit. of the accomplishment); but after 'the consecration they are said to be and are properly Christ's 'body and blood.'

P. 227. "Rabanus Maurus [century IX.] seems to admit that the body of Christ—not the earthly body of Jesus, but a heavenly body in which the Word clothes itself—is united with the signs [see extracts from that eminent man shewing how confused were the ideas of many, and how they caught at the term the Logos to help them, as if it meant something besides the Divine Son of God].

Cependant avec le temps et la suite surtout des controverses sur la personne de Jésus-Christ les idées s'éclaircissent et se précisèrent : la doctrine d'un sacrifice d'expiation offert par le prêtre, à l'instar des prêtres Juifs, se répandit de plus en plus, et, avec elle, des idées de plus en plus favorables à la transubstantiation, en sorte que le septième concile œcuménique, tenu en Nicée en 787, rencontra une approbation presque unanime lorsqu'il proclama qu'après la consecration le pain et le vin ne sont plus des figures, mais véritablement le corps et sang du Christ. Mansi, Concil. XIII. 266. Οὐτε ὁ Κύριος οὔτε οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡ πατέρες εἰκόνα εἶπον τὴν διὰ τοῦ ἱερέως προσφερομένην ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν, ἀλλὰ αὐτὸ σῶμα καὶ αὐτὸ αἷμα. Πρὸ μὲν τῆς τοῦ ἁγιασμοῦ τελειώσεως ἀντίτυπὰ τισι τῶν πατέρων εὐσεβῶς ἔδοξεν ὀνομάζεσθαι μετὰ δὲ τὸν ἁγιασμὸν σῶμα κυρίως καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ καὶ λέγονται καὶ εἰσίν.

P. 227.

Raban semble d'admettre que le corps du Christ, non pas le corps terrestre de Jésus, mais un corps céleste, que le Logos revêt, s'unit aux

This controversy terminated not at this period. The forces of the two parties were yet in an equilibrium. Meanwhile the doctrine of transubstantiation...more fit to seduce the people's imagination, because it offers the marvellous to them, spread more and more... especially by the influence of pretended miracles which its partisans called to their aid. [The egg of transubstantiation was it seems to me laid very early: and all its marvels were in it from the first. In fact Cent. XIII. defined it, and in so doing reduced to order and cut off some excrescences. It is in truth the nearest to being tenable of all theories except the simple truth of the figurative or metaphorical or symbolical meaning of Christ's words.]

P. 309. "Berengar of Tours. In fine the sacrifice of the mass is only an act commemorative of the Saviour's sacrifice. [Surely it is a way of obtaining grace. Berengar believed this, and M. Haag. The words above should never once be said.] A sacrifice which has been accomplished once for all men, and cannot be renewed. Jesus in instituting the supper has employed the words, 'the body and the blood' in a tropical or figurative sense, and the words 'bread and wine' in their natural sense. The priestly blessing produces no change in the substance of the elements... The mouth receives the bread and wine, but the man within eats and drinks, spiritually by faith, Jesus Christ's body and blood, provided he communicate worthily.

P. 338. "Luther in his theses [nailed on Wittenberg church-door] shews himself the humble and submissive son of the Roman church, from which he did not openly separate, as we know, till

symboles. Cette controverse ne se termina pas dans cette période. Les forces des deux parties se faisaient encore équilibre. Cependant la doctrine de transubstantiation ... plus propre à séduire l'imagination du peuple, parce qu'elle offre de merveilleux, se répandit de plus en plus ... surtout par les prétendus miracles, que ses partisans appelèrent à leur secours.

P. 309.

Berengar de Tours. Enfin le sacrifice de la messe n'est qu'un acte commémoratif du sacrifice du Sauveur ; sacrifice qui a été accompli une fois pour toutes et ne peut se renouveler. Jésus en instituant la cène a employé les mots, "le corps et le sang," dans un sens tropique ou figuré, ceux de pain et de vin dans leur sens naturel. La bénédiction sacerdotale ne produit aucun changement dans la substance des éléments... La bouche reçoit ce pain et vin, mais l'homme intérieur mange et boit, spirituellement par la foi, le corps et le sang de Jésus-Christ, pourvu qu'il communie dignement.

P. 338.

Luther dans ses thèses se montre encore le fils humble et soumis de l'église Romaine, dont il ne se sépara ouvertement, on le sait, que trois

three years later, Dec. 10, 1520, by an act of grand audacity. With the exception of the indulgences he condemns nothing, absolutely nothing, either in the doctrines or in the institutions of catholicism. Zwingel on the contrary in his works passes in review all that men had to reproach the dominant church, and loftily demands a reform after the model of the apostolic church.

II. p. 248. Note, Luther on the Babylonish captivity, p. 278. "Nor can it be true that there is in the sacraments an efficacious force of justifying, or that they are efficacious signs of grace. [In this Luther is quite in the van.]

P. 306. "Luther after many hesitations and numerous combats with himself stopped at the doctrine of consubstantiation, hoping thus to combine the exigencies of his own reason with the Bible's words, which seemed to him imperative [for the literal sense]. His subtle theory [Does it deserve this title? Its chief point is a disarrangement of the order of things in the miraculous gift: it does escape changing the bread, &c. into Christ's body], which admits no change of substance in the elements of the supper, but an internal necessary presence in substance of the body and blood of Jesus Christ; under, with, and in the bread of the eucharist, does not seem, whatever its partisans say for it, to be widely separated from transubstantiation, which the first Lutheran creeds (formulæ) teach even in a very clear way. It provoked a violent dispute between him and Carlstadt, 1545 (see Göbel), who rejected

ans plus tard le 10 Décembre 1520, par un acte d'une grande audace. A l'exception des indulgences il ne condamne rien, absolument rien, ni dans les doctrines ni dans les institutions du catholicisme. Zwingle au contraire passe en revue dans les siennes tout ce que l'on avait à reprocher à l'église dominante, et demande hautement une réforme d'après le modèle de l'église apostolique.

*Vol. II. P. 248. Note quoting Luther De capt. Bab. Vol. II. p. 273.*

Nec verum esse potest sacramentis inesse vim efficacem justificationis, seu esse signa efficacia gratiæ.

*P. 306.*

Luther ... après beaucoup d'hésitations et de nombreux combats avec lui-même s'arrêta à la doctrine de consubstantiation, espérant concilier ainsi les exigences de sa propre raison avec un texte Biblique qui lui semblait très impératif. Sa subtile théorie, qui admet, non pas un changement de substance dans les élémens de la Cène, mais la présence substantielle interne et nécessaire du corps et du sang de Jésus-Christ, sous avec et dans le pain eucharistique, ne semble pas, quoiqu'en disent ses partisans, s'éloigner beaucoup de la transubstantiation, que les premières symboles Luthériens enseignent, même d'une manière assez claire. Elle provoqua une dispute violente entre lui et Carlstadt, 1545

the bodily presence as useless, seeing it could not procure any grace for man, of which Christ's death on the cross had not already put him in possession. Carlstadt foolishly maintains that the word 'This' applies to the body of Jesus [as if Christ had said 'This My body is My body']. This explanation is a little forced. That of Zwingel, who as Capito, Bucer, and almost all the reformers of the school of Erasmus, also rejected the real presence, was more simple and natural. With him the sacrament is only a sign, the pledge of a grace bestowed. [Also a help to obtain it. See Zwingel's own volumes.] This opinion of a purely symbolical presence [a presence by the sacred signs, *i.e.* not a real natural presence at all] was defended in 1525 and by Hausschein in 1531, with so much logic and erudition, that Erasmus avowed that the elect themselves might allow themselves to be taken by it... He leaves to the word 'is' its proper meaning, and... thinks he finds a figure or trope in the words 'My body'... Calvin, taking a kind of middle term between the theories of Luther and Zwingel, taught that Christ is not present *only* in figure in the supper; that He is there really and substantially for the believer, who thus by a spiritual communication becomes partaker in the true body and true blood of Jesus Christ. Calvin's theory was admitted by the sacramentaries of Switzerland without much resistance, for Zwingel, perhaps through a spirit of conciliation, had already recognized as did the ancient fathers of the church [as Justin], that the bread of the supper is not ordinary bread but sacramental bread sanctified by the spiritual presence of Christ [see extracts under the head

---

(Göbel, 1843), qui rejetait la présence corporelle comme inutile, vu qu'elle ne pouvait procurer à l'homme aucune grâce, que la mort de Jésus-Christ sur la croix ne l'eût déjà mis en possession. Carlstadt prétendant que le mot "Ceci" s'applique au corps de Jésus... Cette explication était un peu forcée. Celle de Zwingle, qui comme Capito, Bucer, et en général tous les réformateurs de l'école d'Erasmus, rejetait aussi la présence réelle, était plus simple et plus naturelle... Pour lui le sacrement n'est qu'un signe, le gage d'une grâce accordée. Cette opinion d'une présence purement symbolique fut défendue en 1525 (par Écolampade, 1531) avec tant de logique et d'érudition, qu'Erasmus avouait que les élus eux-mêmes pourraient s'y laisser prendre... Il laisse au verbe "est" sa signification propre, et ... croit trouver un trope dans les mots "Mon corps"... Calvin, prenant une espèce de moyen terme entre la théorie de Luther et celle de Zwingle, enseigna que le Christ n'est pas présent seulement en figure dans la Cène; qu'il y est *réellement et substantiellement* pour le croyant, qui devient ainsi par une communication spirituelle participant au *vrai* corps et au *vrai* sang de Jésus-Christ... La théorie de Calvin fut admise sans trop de résistances, par les sacramentaires [*i.e.* believers in the sign] de la Suisse; car Zwingle, *par esprit de conciliation* peut-être, avait déjà reconnu, comme les anciens pères de l'église, que le pain de la cène n'est pas du pain ordinaire mais du pain sacramental, sanctifié par la présence spirituelle

Hospinian] and the confession of the four cities [after Zwingel's death] had already [before Calvin] proclaimed that the Saviour of the world offers *His true body* to the faithful to eat for the nourishing of their souls.... But it in no way satisfied the Lutherans... The attempt at conciliation by Melancthon failed. The theory of Calvin, adopted as it was by the reformed in France and in England, in Scotland and in Holland as by those in Switzerland, and by a part of Germany, had to defend itself... against the attacks of the catholic theologians, to whom Plessis Mornay, Albertin, Blondel, and others answered with much erudition and skill, but without attaining to the removal of the contradiction presented by the Calvinist dogma, when he speaks of a body being spiritually eaten. [And there is another, *viz.* that he affirms Christ's body to be in Heaven and yet so united with believers on earth that it is with them too.] Also this theory has been generally abandoned and almost all the reformed are returned to that of Zwingel. [Lutherans and numbers of English churchmen excepted.] At this day, as I have just said, the Zwinglian or mnemonic theory reigns almost universally in the protestant church... The supernaturalists, who still speak in Luther's sense of a substantial presence, understand no more than a presence of operation, &c. [*i.e.* operating power, not a presence]. As to the rationalists the greater part without hesitation rejected the church dogma to adopt the theory of Zwingel.

I. 426. "Puseyism. Its avowed aim was to reestablish the church on the foundation of apostolic tradition; but the public was

---

du Christ [see ad Carolum Imp. II. 541]; et la confession tetrapolitaine [Zur. Ber. Bas. Stras.] avait déjà proclamé que le Sauveur offre aux fidèles *son vrai corps* à manger pour nourriture de leurs âmes... Mais il ne satisfait nullement les Luthériens... La tentative de conciliation faite par Melancthon échoua. Adoptée par les réformés de France et d'Angleterre d'Ecosse et de Hollande comme par ceux de Suisse, et par une partie d'Allemagne, la théorie de Calvin eut à se défendre... contre les attaques des théologiens catholiques, auxquels Du Plessis Mornay, Aubertin, Blondel, et d'autres répondirent avec beaucoup d'érudition et d'habileté, mais sans parvenir à détruire la contradiction que le dogme Calviniste présente, lorsqu'il parle d'un corps qui se mange spirituellement. Ainsi cette théorie a-t-elle été *généralement abandonnée*, et presque tous les réformés *sont revenus à celle de Zwingle*, &c. Aujourd'hui, comme nous venons de le dire, la théorie Zwinglienne, ou mnemonique, domine à peu près généralement dans l'église Protestante. Les supernaturalistes, qui parlent encore dans le sens de Luther d'une présence substantielle, *n'entendent pas par là qu'une présence operative*, &c. Quant aux Rationalistes la plupart rejetèrent sans hésiter le dogme ecclésiastique pour adopter la théorie de Zwingle.

Vol. I. p. 426. *Le Puseyisme.*

Son but avoué était de rétablir l'église sur le fondement de la tradi-

not slow to perceive that it led them direct to catholicism by its exaggerated regard for apostolic succession and for the tradition of the six first ages [as said by Knox, and Jebb], a source of faith as pure as the gospel in the opinion of its followers. For some years Puseyism confined itself within certain bounds...rejecting the transubstantiation of the sacramental appearances [or kinds] *without ever denying* that the true body and the true blood of Jesus Christ are in the sacrament, and that they are offered *as a sacrifice* of reconciliation. But the tendency...became soon more and more manifest. The numerous conversions to catholicism, which have taken place in this sect till 1843, have justified, up to a certain point, the suspicion that its chiefs were, for the most part, only Roman catholics, who disguised their true sentiments in the senseless hope of bringing back England to the Pope's feet." [This is the judgment of a foreigner. Perhaps we shall some day find out whether his judgment is true or in error.]

---

tion apostolique ; mais on ne tarda pas à apercevoir qu'il conduisait directement au catholicisme par son respect exagéré pour la succession apostolique et pour la tradition des six premiers siècles—source de la foi *aussi pure* que l'évangile dans l'opinion des sectateurs. Dans quelques années pourtant il se renferma dans certaines bornes ... rejetant la transubstantiation des espèces sacramentelles sans nier toutefois que *le vrai corps* et le *vrai sang* de Jésus-Christ sont dans le sacrement, et qu'ils *sont offerts en sacrifice* de reconciliation ; mais la tendance ... devint bientôt de plus en plus manifeste. Les nombreuses conversions au catholicisme qui ont eu lieu dans cette secte depuis 1843 ont justifié, jusqu'à un certain point, le soupçon que ses chefs n'étaient, par la plupart, que des catholiques Romains, qui déguisaient leurs véritables sentiments, dans l'espoir insensé de ramener l'Angleterre aux pieds du Pape. [The heaven still works in the same way, Nov. 1878.]

(E.) WILHELM LUBKE, PROFESSOR OF ART-HISTORY IN STUTTGARDT.

*Ecclesiastical Art in Germany.* Trans. Wheatley, Ed. v.  
London, 1871.

*The Gothic Style. The Altar.* P. 115. "When a sacrifice is to be offered up, the first necessity of worship is the altar. The bloodless sacrifice of the mass in Christianity, even in the earliest times, called forth the new doctrine of the altar. At first it was, as it appears, of wood, and had its name, mensa Domini, the Lord's table, in remembrance of the supper table on which Christ had placed the sacrifice of the eucharist. In the chief altar of the Lateran church at Rome such an altar (table) is still shewn enclosed ; on which S. Peter is said to have offered the sacrifice of the mass. It is distinguished from all the other altars of catholic Christianity by the peculiarity, that it alone contains no



relics. The altars were generally placed over the graves of the martyrs; and thence originated the law that no altar was to be erected without being consecrated by those holy relics. Where no grave of a saint was to be had, relics were enclosed in the altar, &c. &c. [P. 116.] The oldest form of the Christian altar is that of a rectangular sarcophagus, &c. [P. 124.] There soon arose for its protection a baldacchin resting on four columns, the so-called 'ciborium,' from the centre of which hung the vessel with the consecrated bread, often in the form of a dove. On the sides were introduced moveable curtains on poles which were used by the celebrant in the chief moments of the offering of the mass to preserve from profane gaze the treatment of the sacred elements. [P. 125.] Another form—the wall altar, &c. [P. 126.] This back wall of the altar—superfrontale. [P. 144.] To preserve the consecrated bread round boxes of ivory, also of wood or precious metals, were used in the early Christian times [see Andreas], &c. a favourite form...a dove, peristerium, as an emblem of the Holy Ghost. These doves of gold or silver and sometimes of enamelled copper stood on a dish which hung down on cords from the top of the ciborium. In Germany three...Salzburg, Erfurt, and monastery of Göttweih. [P. 147.] Monstrances...arose from the festival of Corpus Christi (13th century and 14th and 15th). [P. 151.] Censers and incense cups. [P. 154.] Pouring vessels, manilia, for washing of hands...Mass bells, with which were given the signs of the principal moments in the sacred service. [P. 155.] A vessel in Münster, supposed to be for use in washing the chalice between one high mass and another."

We have thus the testimony of architecture to the opinions that prevailed. In Martigny's Dict. Ch. Antiq. quoted with one of the extracts from Jerome is a picture from the walls of the same cemetery of a feast with fish, ἰχθὺς, on the table and baskets of bread ranged on the ground. See p. 246. The fish meaning Christ.

(F.) **ENCYCLOPÉDIE DICTIONNAIRE DE LA RELIGION CATHOLIQUE**,  
Third Edition, 1869. The word *Eucharist*.

P. 118. "The eating of the eucharist gives to those that eat it eternal life. [P. 119.] The literal interpretation is recognized

---

*Dictionnaire encyclopédique de la Religion Catholique*. Paris, 1869.  
Publié par les soins du Dr Wetzer et du Dr Welte en allemand et traduit par le chanoine J. Goshler. Troisième Edition. 26 tom.  
Mot Eucharistie. P. 118.

La manducation de l'eucharistie donne à ceux qui la mangent la vie éternelle... P. 119. L'interprétation littérale est reconnue par le

by the Lord Himself, John vi., as the just and true interpretation : if it were not, He ought to have contradicted the false interpretation of His disciples...Holy Scripture also proves from the highest antiquity the doctrine of the primitive church to have been that in the eucharist the faithful eats the body and drinks the blood of Christ, and that he has nothing to do with a spiritual and figurative eating. [Wiseman's lectures quoted against interpreting "is" as "signifies", and Justin Martyr's 1st apology.] This passage of Justin takes us straight to the doctrine of transubstantiation. After this change the visible appearances of the bread and the wine (still) subsist, but the bread is no longer the bread ; it is the body of Jesus Christ, &c. [Cyril of Jerusalem.] All the fathers speak to the same purport. S. Gregory of Nyssa, S. Chrysostom, S. Augustine, finally all the liturgies of the churches of the most ancient date are unanimous—the Churches, Eastern, Greek, Latin, all speak of the real and substantial body and blood of Jesus Christ.

P. 121. "The eucharist then is the great sacrament of union, by which is realized the prayer of Christ the Supreme Pontiff 'Thou 'in Me and I in them, &c. &c.' The eucharist is as much a sacrifice as a sacrament. [After quoting Hebrews respecting the sacrifice of Christ's death being once for all, it continues] but nothing in all that is contrary to the catholic doctrine regarding the perpetual renewal of the sacrifice of Christ in the mass...That which Christ has done for the human race He continues to do

---

Seigneur lui-même comme l'interprétation juste et vraie [John vi.] : sans cela il aurait dû contredire la fausse interprétation de ses disciples ... L'écriture sainte prouve aussi, que dès la plus haute antiquité la doctrine de l'église primitive a été que dans l'eucharistie le fidèle mange le corps et boit le sang du Christ, et qu'il ne s'agit en aucune façon d'une manducation spirituelle et figurative. Wiseman quoted as to "signifies" not being the meaning of "is:" and Justin Apol. i. Ce passage de S. Justin nous mène directement au dogme de la transubstantiation ... Après ce changement les espèces visibles du pain et du vin subsistent : mais le pain n'est plus le pain : il est le corps de Jésus-Christ, &c. Cyril of Jerusalem quoted, Cat. Myst.... Tous les pères parlent de même. S. Gregoire de Nyse ; S. Chrysostome, S. Augustin, enfin toutes les liturgies des églises les plus anciennes sont unanimes : les églises, orientale, Grecque, et Latine, parlent toutes du corps et du sang réels et substantiels de Jésus-Christ.

P. 121.

L'eucharistie est donc le grand sacrement de l'union, par lequel se réalise la prière du Christ, Pontife suprême, "Vous en moi et moi en "eux, &c." ... L'eucharistie de même qu'elle est un sacrement, *est un sacrifice*. ... Mais rien de tout cela n'est contraire à la doctrine catholique concernant le perpétuel renouvellement du sacrifice de Jésus-Christ dans la messe ... Ce que le Christ a fait pour le genre humain, il

without pause for the individuals of the race living under different times and in divers places. It is always the same with it, especially in His expiatory sacrifice. [The Council of Trent quoted.]... He alone can approach to the holy sacrament who is worthy of it. Infants of tender age are excluded; as also infidels and heretics. In the ancient church penitents also were deprived of it. According to the laws of the church every Christian ought, after being well prepared, to draw near, at least once in a year, to the Lord's table, [*i.e.* every baptized person not separated from the church is *supposed fit*, or able to be made fit by the drilling of his priest]. As regards the substance of the dogma [of the real presence] it was attacked in the middle of the eleventh century in the Latin church by Berengar of Tours. Already in the ninth age Erigena had pronounced in favour of a symbolical and figurative interpretation. His opinions were censured, as they deserved. The fourth council of the Lateran, 1215, &c. &c.

P. 123. "Although the Swiss reformers had admitted Calvin's opinion in the convention of Zurich, and later synods of the reformed attached themselves to it, (yet) in the course of time the opinion of Zwingle obtained the preeminence [See M. Haag's judgment to the same effect]: and this clearly establishes the religious state of Switzerland and Germany [He ignores the old Lutherans who are unchanged], which believe the one as little as the other in the reality and truth of the Christian system" [*i.e.* the authors of this German work translated into French count the Tridentine doctrines on the Lord's supper "Christianism," *i.e.* the Christian system, and reject Germans as well as French].

---

*continue à le faire, sans relâche, pour les individus du genre vivants dans différents temps et en divers lieux. Il en est de même surtout de son sacrifice expiatoire. Council of Trent quoted... Celui-là seul peut s'approcher de ce sacrement qui en est digne. Les enfans en bas âge en sont exclus: de même les infidèles les hérétiques; dans l'ancienne église les pénitents en étaient aussi privés. D'après les lois de l'église tout Chrétien doit, après s'être bien préparé, approcher (au moins une fois dans l'année) de la table du Seigneur. Quant à la substance même du dogme elle fut attaquée au milieu du onzième siècle dans l'église Latine par Berenger de Tours. Déjà au neuvième siècle Erigène s'était prononcé pour l'interprétation symbolique et figurée. Ses opinions furent, comme elles devaient l'être, censurées... Le quatrième concile de Lateran de 1215, &c. &c.*

P. 123.

Quoique les réformateurs Helvétiques eussent admis dans la convention de Zurich l'opinion de Calvin, et que les synodes postérieurs des réformés s'y rattachassent, avec le cours du temps l'opinion de Zwingle obtint la prééminence, et c'est ce que constate clairement l'état religieux de la Suisse et de l'Allemagne, qui croient aussi peu l'une que l'autre en la réalité et la vérité du Christianisme.

(G.) DEAN GOODE AND ARCHDEACONS WILBERFORCE AND  
DENISON, A.D. 1856.

The exact line of argument, adopted by Dean William Goode in his work "On the Eucharist," seems to demand a fuller examination than could be given to it in this Part. It is therefore reserved for the proposed Third and concluding portion, in company with a few other select witnesses on both sides of the question. The writer of this work may be excused for stating that his personal esteem and affection for Dean Goode were founded on intimate acquaintance, as he had the honour of acting in close conjunction with him in some matters, particularly on the delicate and still unsolved question, how a sufficient supply of clergymen is to be created; and it may be useful to state that in that part of one public memorial, that came from the Dean's pen, he boldly put forth the idea that the bishops might some day be forced to take up the position of not so much asking from what places of instruction candidates came, as of requiring that they should be *in all respects* duly qualified. The late Bishop of Lichfield in his Theological College adopted this principle, and in his last examination of the candidates for the order of priests a non-university man stood very decidedly at the head of the list which consisted of twelve, seven of whom were university men. But to return from this little digression, the object of which is to make the wise lips of the departed still speak to us—I have selected salient passages from those writings of the two archdeacons which the Dean cites, deeming that these, together with part of the Dean's replies, may suffice in relation to them; as I believe it to be generally held that the Dean's refutation of their writings on this subject may be regarded as an accomplished fact.

*The nature of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist.*

P. 104. On John vi. "The question is, whether the words were spoken *formally* and *directly* of eating and drinking the bread and wine in the eucharist...I would at once reply to the remarks by which Archdeacon Wilberforce tries to neutralize the force of them [*i.e.* of the passages Dean Goode is about to adduce from the fathers]. He would fain persuade us that when the ancient writers speak of the body and blood of Christ in

connexion with any spiritual communion with Him apart from the reception of the eucharist, they are speaking of a benefit bestowed through extraordinary channels; and to meet such expressions it is admitted, as of course it could not be denied, that 'virtue issues from our Lord as the fountain of grace in 'any manner which pleases Him'; and the astounding hypothesis is put forward, that when the body and blood of Christ are spoken of as imparted to those who in this extraordinary manner are brought into relation to Christ, it is not because flesh and blood are employed as metaphorical terms for expressing grace or doctrines—in which I agree with him—but because the holy eucharist, being the sacrament of Christ's flesh and blood, suggests the order in which the gifts are communicated [pp. 200, 201 of Archdeacon Wilberforce's book]. It would be useless to comment on such a hypothesis, and there needs no other reply than that the supposition that these writers [the fathers] are speaking of anything out of the ordinary course of things is *entirely groundless*, and contrary to the language they use. When they interpret these words as referring to a spiritual act of the mind, they give that interpretation as the proper interpretation of the words; and in so doing, even though they may elsewhere apply the words to the eucharistic rite, they negative the Archdeacon's interpretation of them. The distinction between interpreting the words as spoken expressly of the eucharist, and using them as applicable to what takes place in the eucharist, is...well put by Waterland (Rev. of Doct. of Eucharist, Ch. 6, Vol. iv. p. 543. Oxford, 1843).

To these remarks Archdeacon Wilberforce thinks himself justified in giving the following answer, 'It has been shewn that 'the sixth chapter of St John consists of two parts: first, we have 'a general statement of our Lord's mediation, v. 30—50, and then 'a declaration that the holy eucharist is the medium through 'which its benefits are communicated, v. 51—58. But Water-land's makes no account of the latter set of expressions...Water-land gives no reason why the ancient writers should have considered these words to be so plainly relevant to the holy eucharist, 'that they almost invariably quote them in this relation. How 'came they thus to employ them unless they supposed that this 'was the natural force of the words: or how could they venture 'to give this meaning to our Lord's words unless such had been 'their received interpretation?'

P. 204. The Dean answers. "Now to what cause we are to attribute such a mode of arguing on the subject I will not pretend to say. Whether it be from confusion of mind, or some other cause, I leave the reader to determine. But certainly such argumentation can do no harm but to its author.

As to Archdeacon Denison, Dean Goode, ch. II. p. 11, quotes from the Archdeacon's correspondence with Bishop Spencer. "I hold the doctrine of the real presence as declared and taught by the Church of England to be this: 1st, negatively, that there is not a corporal presence of the body and blood of Christ in the bread and wine ... 2dly, affirmatively, that there is a real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the sacramental bread and wine in a manner, which, as the holy Scripture has not explained, the church has not defined. That the body and blood of Christ, being really present in the sacramental bread and wine, are given in and by the outward sign to all, and are received by all. That whether the body and blood of Christ be given and received unto life or unto death, this depends upon the state of the heart and mind of the receiver:—in other words that the body and blood of Christ are present to all objectively,—subjectively that they are present to the faithful only. My language in my letter of April 25 does mean what is, always has been, and always will be my meaning, and what you understand it to mean, *viz.* that in holy communion the body and blood of Christ are received by all. I had hoped that I had made it so clear that I hold the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the sacramental bread and wine to be purely and absolutely a spiritual presence, as to have guarded myself definitely and effectually against being supposed to approach, however remotely, the confines of the doctrine of consubstantiation ... That there is a real presence, not material, or as it is said, not corporal, but immaterial and spiritual of the body and blood of Christ in the consecrated bread and wine. And that the body and blood of Christ, being really present in the consecrated bread and wine after an immaterial and spiritual manner—a manner, which as holy Scripture has not explained the church has not defined—are given therein and thereby to all, and are received by all who come to the Lord's table ... If we *know*, as we certainly *do know*, that the bread and wine retaining their very natural substances, become in some ineffable way the body and blood of Christ through the consecrating power of the priest—which is the plain teaching of holy Scripture, and witnessed to as such by the undoubting testimony of the church catholic—it follows from holy Scripture, and *ex necessitate rei*—seeing that we do not know, as we certainly do not, that the presence thus vouchsafed is under any circumstances withdrawn, so that the bread and wine cease to be that which by consecration they have become—it follows I say from holy Scripture and *ex necessitate rei*, that the body and blood of Christ are given in and by the consecrated bread and wine to all and are received by all who come to the Lord's table.'" (Serm. i. pp. 19, 20.)

I have reluctantly inserted this: and I only say, as it concerns others too, that my mind refuses to admit the terms "an imma-

“terial body” or “a purely spiritual presence of body and blood.” Also the body and blood of Christ are now in Heaven and not here, except in thought. I can grasp no more than that the thought of the body and blood of Christ given and shed is in my mind, and moves my heart to gratitude and love, and in calling upon God in such deeply-affecting meditations, I receive all blessing and grace to enable me to feel my union with Him and with all His people in every age, and to supply me with power to overcome sin and to act after His pattern till He comes to earth again or I go to Him. The more I read and the more I meditate on the subject, and the longer my experience of this present earthly conflict continues, the more do I find this view fill the whole horizon. Bear Saravia in mind in reading what now follows.

P. 186. “It will hardly be denied that the doctrine of the ancient church according to Augustine and certainly of our own catechism is, that there are two parts in a sacrament, and that these two parts are the outward and visible sign and the inward ‘and spiritual grace.’ But, according to the doctrine of our authors, in one of the two sacraments there are three: *viz.* the outward and visible sign, the thing which the outward and visible sign represents, and the inward and spiritual grace: and it is maintained that the two former are received by all communicants, and the third only by faithful communicants. Thus Archdeacon Wilberforce expressly speaks of the eucharist as consisting of the sacramentum, the *res sacramenti*, and the *virtus sacramenti*; of which he maintains that the two former are received by all communicants, and the third by the faithful only. The same thing is done by Archdeacon Denison. He also distinguishes between the sacramentum, the *res sacramenti*, and the *virtus* or *gratia sacramenti*. I grant that both these authors in order to save themselves from a palpable contrariety to the doctrine both of the ancient church and our own, maintain that the sacrament consists of two parts: and in the eucharist they make these two parts to be the sacramentum and the *res sacramenti*; making the *virtus* or *gratia* to be an effect which may or may not follow from the reception of the *res* ... The second part of the sacrament is, according to the definition of Augustine and our church, the inward and spiritual grace, the *virtus* or *gratia sacramenti*, and not the *res sacramenti*, or body and blood of Christ. And it is admitted that this is received, and can only be received, by the soul.

In page 185 Dean Goode quotes Bishop Taylor’s denial that Christ’s body is present after the manner of a spirit. The words

merit to be well remembered. "This is not merely a thing beyond our comprehension but it involves nonsense."

P. 210. "The third sophism I would point out is the application of the phrase 'real and spiritual presence' to mean the real presence of a body after the manner of existence of a spirit... Our old divines have frequently insisted... none more for instance than Bishop Jeremy Taylor... on the necessity of holding a real spiritual presence of Christ in the eucharist... But the phrase standing alone has been a mine of wealth to the authors under review. They seem to have thought it all they wanted... [P. 211.] that a body remaining a body should nevertheless be in the form of a spirit is, they will admit, rather mysterious, like black in the form of white, &c."

So the Dean denounces this expression P. 212 "as an ingenious device to rob the present generation in our church of its 'dearest birthright in the blood-bought Protestant orthodoxy of 'its faith, &c.'" and he quotes Bishop J. Taylor's Tract on the real presence and spiritual of Christ in the blessed sacrament, p. 13, Ed. 14. "By spiritually they [Bellarmine, &c.] mean, after the manner of a spirit: we mean present to our spirits only, *i.e.* "Christ is not present to any other sense but that of faith or "spiritual susception; but their way makes His body to be present "in no way but that which is impossible and implies a contradiction; a body not after the manner of a body; a body like a "spirit: a body without a body: and a sacrifice of body and blood "without body and blood; corpus incorporeum, cruor incruentus... "Not after the manner of all bodies nor any body, but after that "manner of being in which an angel is in a place. That is *their* "'spiritually.'" Is it sense to say that Christ is present with the soul or to be eaten by it, unless in the most purely figurative and metaphorical use of these terms? *i.e.* The true natural body of Christ is present with and is eaten by the soul only after a figurative manner, *i.e.* it is not present to the soul as a true natural body because it is in Heaven and not here, and the soul as well as the body is here and not in Heaven. See "Extracts" from Lorimer's Knox and the Church of England in relation to the rubric on kneeling and its true history.

It is with regret that I am once more obliged openly to confess that I cannot reconcile one answer in our Catechism with the rubric on kneeling and the rest of our church's utterance both in her services and her articles: and it is owing in my judgment to



that one unhappy utterance that the Dean has left some "miry places" in his excellent line of defence, weak points which not even his skill can fortify, and at which such an opponent as Mag. Capel could easily enter and overthrow not the truth but the Dean's reputation for logical accuracy. It is to be observed, c. III. p. 56, that the Dean's book is explicitly a defence of the Church of England, which he assumes to be at all points "scriptural."

The unavoidable entanglement of the utterances of the various authors seems to make a condensed synopsis desirable. The Archdeacons hold (1) a sacramentum or sign, the bread and wine, (2) the *res sacramenti*, Christ's body and blood present in an immaterial and spiritual mode, and (3) or as an annex to (2), the *virtus* or *gratia sacramenti*. Dean Goode and with him Jeremy Taylor say that their own and our church's doctrine is, (1) that the Church of Rome and these Archdeacons err in explaining the term "the spiritual presence of Christ's body," a presence after the manner of a spirit, which they think a confusion of ideas: and (2) the Dean and the Bishop affirm for themselves and as the church's doctrine, that the spiritual presence of Christ's body means its being present with our souls and being eaten by them. The compiler of this work pleads that in the rubric on kneeling the body of Christ is said not to be on earth but in Heaven, and therefore that it is not present in our souls which are not in Heaven but here; and he begs to express regret that the Dean's work, in dwelling chiefly on the proof of the church's doctrine, seems to ignore the possibility that it can fail to agree at all points with the explicit and implicit teaching of the Scriptures of God on this ever-agitated subject.

I would fain cite no more from Dean Goode's work now in this Part, but perhaps I ought to bring to the front two other points on which he writes with great care in relation to Objections (5) and (8), near the close of his fourth chapter.

P. 217. Objection (5). How can Christ's body be eaten by faith? He defends even the expression of Cranmer that it is Christ's true organical body that is eaten, and he justifies the saying so common, as we have seen in the fathers, that the body that is present is the same body that was crucified on the cross, &c., &c., which made Ridley declare that the wine in the cup is the same blood that flowed from Christ's side, and then he added, but in a figure. But we answer that its being such only in a figure

makes it not the same. And in fact are we not suffering the penalties of nearly eighteen centuries' abuse of terms? Do not those who maintain the very error of errors, to oppose which our martyrs died, nestle and burrow in the rash and unreasonable use of terms like these? Is not this one great reason why the cancer of sacramental error is even now swelling and breaking forth anew, convulsing the church and confounding its rulers ecclesiastical and civil?

Again, p. 221. Objection (8). The frequent use of phrases that bear two senses, and the misapplication of passages from our great divines for the purpose of proving doctrines opposed to the manifest views of their authors. Has not the like ambiguity lurked in the pages of the ancient fathers, and has it not appeared that they suffered from the moral disease of being of two minds? This charge is made also against many of the English fathers too. My readers have made up their own minds how far the charge is true. If it is, then the onus rests on them, not on those who mourn for a misuse of terms, which goes far to create a hatred and contempt for theology. An ardent follower of this system might almost maintain that Zwingel and Calvin speak almost to the same real purpose as Ambrose and Gregory of Nyssa and Cyril of Jerusalem. It is but going a little further in the bringing down of hills and levelling up of valleys.

(H.) THE REV. JOHN HARRISON, D.D., VICAR OF FENWICK, NEAR  
DONCASTER.

He is the author of two elaborate works, entitled "Whose are the Fathers?" and "An answer to the Challenge of Dr Pusey." The line which he has taken in the latter work in the interpreting of the language of the early fathers in relation to the Lord's supper has brought on some strong though friendly discussion between him and Dr Jacob the author of "The ecclesiastical polity of the New Testament," also of a letter in the Record of Jan. 28, 1877. It is perhaps sufficient for me to state that the frequent argumentative and often verbal coincidences between this work of mine and Dr Jacob's were perfectly independent on my part, since that portion of my work was written before I had seen Dr Jacob's. The identity of language is so close that I could not but be consoled by the exact concurrence of my conclusions with those of one

of these two champions, where I had the misfortune of differing from the other. Ties however of common work had given to the latter a warm personal interest which caused me greatly to rejoice in all the service that he has rendered to Bible truth and to the Church of England. Dr Harrison's line of argument is summarized by himself in a series of "Rules for interpreting the fathers" at p. 15 of his latest pamphlet, his letter to Dr Pusey. These rules will perhaps sufficiently exhibit the line of his arguments on this momentous question.

"In endeavouring to come to a right understanding of the teaching of the fathers in relation to the Lord's supper, I have observed some such rules as the following:—(1) There must be some fixed principles of quotation from the voluminous writings of the fathers of what relates to the doctrine of the Lord's supper. Their real opinions must be obtained, not from half-a-dozen sentences, not easily explained from as many folio volumes, but from their plainer and more numerous statements; and the latter and not the former must be understood to express their real opinions. (2) The question is, whether the early fathers did teach the doctrine of the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements, not whether they were right or wrong in their interpretation and use of Holy Scripture. (3) As it is universally admitted that during the first eight centuries there was no controversy concerning the Real Presence, as now maintained by some, it is not to be expected that there could be any formal or direct denial of it, and the evidence against it could not be otherwise than indirect. (4) As the doctrine in question is of so simple and solemn a nature, and of such fundamental importance, words, phrases, illustrations, and arguments used in relation to the consecrated elements which appear to derogate from their supposed exalted sanctity as containing the body, soul, and divinity of Christ, are proofs against the doctrine. (5) It is not to be assumed without proof, especially in relation to the doctrine of the Lord's supper, that fathers contradict fathers, and that every father contradicts himself. (6) The real sentiments of the fathers are to be obtained, not from their highly rhetorical and figurative language, interpreted literally as plain statements, but from their plain, sober, and unadorned language. (7) There were many reasons why some of the fathers, when commending the observance of the Lord's supper to the faithful, should speak of it in an inflated style and exaggerate its ceremonial, but there could be no reasons why they should apparently disparage that holy ordinance by laying aside their figures of speech and speaking of it in plain and sober language; therefore their sober and more moderate statements are to be taken as expressing their real opinions,

rather than their adorned and rhetorical ones, so that their true sentiments respecting the nature of the Lord's supper are rather to be obtained from their weakest than from their strongest statements respecting it. (8) The words and phrases used by any father in relation to the Lord's supper, must, if possible, be interpreted from his own writings or the writings of contemporary fathers, before any other source of interpretation be resorted to."

As so much of Dr Harrison's writing relates to Professor Pusey, it seems fitting to restate here that the Professor's course of argumentation on this subject occupies so much space in Part III. of this work, that I avoid introducing it in this Second Part as far as it is possible. I have to acknowledge a very courteous letter from Dr Pusey in 1871: which is the more pleasant, as I so widely differ from him as to the nature of this sacrament.

(I.) BISHOP CONNOP THIRLWALL OF S. DAVID'S.

BP 1840. D. 1875.

*Charge*, 1869, P. 241. London, 1877. Upon *The Memorial on the Eucharist*.

"Clearly to be considered as the manifesto of a great party. It divides itself into these heads. The doctrine of the real objective presence of the eucharistic sacrifice, and the adoration of Christ in the blessed sacrifice. They repudiate the opinion of a corporal presence of Christ's natural body and blood: that is to say, *as they are in Heaven*, &c. and transubstantiation. They believe that in the holy eucharist, by virtue of the consecration, through the power of the Holy Ghost, the body and blood of our Saviour Christ—the inward part or thing signified, are *present really and truly*, but spiritually and ineffably, under the outward and visible part or sign or form of bread and wine...As the real objective presence does not appear in any of the subsequent statements it would seem as if in the opinion of those who framed the document it would have added nothing to that which is signified by the adverbs 'really and truly.' But we are thus led to ask whether these terms themselves add anything to that which is signified by the word 'present.' For whatever is present anywhere at all must be really and truly present. But the sense which would most naturally suggest itself, when these words are used with reference to the body and blood of Christ, is that they are present, as they really and truly are, *i.e.* as real flesh and blood. But *this sense is expressly repudiated*. Unless they are merely superfluous adjuncts they must have some other meaning, which is not explained in the context, and is not very easy to find...There are two senses in

which we may speak intelligibly of the presence of a natural object: the one literal, the other figurative. Literally a body is present in the space which it fills; figuratively, it may be present, as a thought to the mind, and in this last sense it might be said to be spiritually present to the thinking subject. But that could not be the meaning of those who describe that which they speak of as an objective presence. They seem to have used the word spiritually as opposed to corporally or physically. We are therefore left to search for some kind of presence which is *neither literal nor figurative*. But in what region of nature can such a presence be found? If our absolute incapacity to conceive it is not a proof that it has no existence, at least it makes it impossible to frame any proposition concerning it, of which we could say that it is either true or false. The only term really appropriate, &c. is *ineffable*. And thus it turns out that the statement which appears to be positive is in fact merely negative. The addition of the words 'under the outward and visible part or sign or form of bread 'and wine,' as it only expresses what is really present, can throw no light on a presence of a totally different kind...If we hold with Hooker that 'the real presence of Christ's body and blood is not 'to be sought from the sacrament but from the worthy receiver of 'the sacrament,' *still the presence would not be the less objective*... The next thing repudiated [in this Memorial] is the notion of any fresh sacrifice, &c. as apart from the one all-sufficient, &c. which alone is 'meritorious.' To this is opposed the belief that as in Heaven Christ, &c., ever offers Himself before the Eternal Father, &c., so on earth in the holy eucharist *that same body*, once for all sacrificed for us, and that same blood, once for all shed for us (sacramentally present) are offered and pleaded before the Father by the priest, as our Lord ordained to be done in remembrance of Himself when He instituted the blessed sacrament of His body and blood...The nature of the Heavenly intercession is a mystery. And if it was intended as an argument to the effect that, because Christ offers Himself in Heaven, therefore it is the object of the eucharist to make the same offering on earth, the argument would be as illogical as the comparison is misapplied. But, &c. in our own Church-Service *we find not a word* to suggest it to any mind... Is then this statement true or false?...The expression 'sacramentally present' appears to be most happily adapted to comprehend every possible shade of opinion, as *some kind* of presence is admitted by all...The Greek verb [for "do"] often has the sense of 'sacrifice' or 'offer'; but *only* when *the noun* which it governs *signifies* that which is a *victim* or offering, and *thus determines the sense of the verb*...Under the *Third* head the signers say, We repudiate all adoration of the sacramental bread and wine, &c. also all adoration of a corporal presence, &c. &c. We believe that Christ Himself, really and truly but spiritually and ineffably present in the sacrament, is therein to be adored, not the less local because (as some

argue) divested of the grossness of a material presence. In the Rubric on kneeling the use of the plural, 'benefits,' precludes the construction that not they, but Christ is said to be given (Keble)... P. 65. If anyone... finds comfort and edification in the thought that, along with the sacramental bread and wine, he in a certain sense receives the whole person of Christ, God and man, I think he has a full right to such edification and comfort... If he should argue that, as the natural body and blood are inseparable from the whole Divine person of Christ, so that *wherever they are, that is*—therefore the same holds with regard to the sacramental body and blood—so that *it* also, by virtue of the hypostatical union, is Christ Himself—this to me appears a sad abuse of words... Nor to my view does this doctrine in the least exalt the dignity or enhance the value of the sacrament as a means of grace; but on the contrary, tends to degrade it into the semblance of a magical rite, &c.... P. 67. The objection to the alleged mystery is not that it is inscrutable, but *that it is factitious*, a creature of human speculation, *the product of an arbitrary and fanciful exegesis*... To accept such a doctrine is not humility, but self-will.

*On the Council of Trent, 1869. Charge. Appendix B.*

"Mr Cobb thinks that transubstantiation has been confused with transaccidentation—a change in the sensible properties (accidents) &c., while transubstantiation, &c., really taught by the Church of Rome is... virtually held by the Church of England... Council of Trent, Sess. XIV. c. IV. [The Latin citations are given in English.] 'This holy Synod declares that by consecration of 'the bread and wine a conversion is made of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ 'our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the 'substance of His blood: which conversion is conveniently and 'properly called transubstantiation by the holy catholic church.' Chap. I. 'For neither is there any inconsistency in our Saviour 'Himself sitting alway at the right hand of God in Heaven 'according to the natural mode of existing, and His being never-'theless sacramentally present with us in many other places in His 'own substance, after that manner of existing, which although 'with words we can hardly express it, is yet possible to God, &c.' The council does not deny the presence of the natural body in the sacrament, but only that it is there *according to its nature and mode of existence* (chap. I.).... 'After the blessing of bread and wine, (Christ) 'has testified in full and perspicuous words (*i. e.* This is body, &c.) 'that He Himself gives (*præbere*) His own body (Suum 'Ipsius) and His own blood': and it inveighs against those who distort them 'to fictitious and imaginary tropes, by which the 'truth' (it does not say the substance) 'of the flesh and blood of 'Christ is denied...' The dispute between the Franciscans and the

Dominicans at the Council of Trent proceeded on this assumption—one party contending that the body of Christ was *translated* from Heaven into the sacraments, the other that it was *created* by each consecration. In Chap. III. the council teaches as ‘the faith ever held by the church of God that instantly after consecration, the true body of our Lord and His true blood are there (existere) together with His soul and Godhead *under the form* of bread and wine; but with the distinction that the presence of the body under the form of bread, &c. is due to the words of consecration (ex vi verborum) while by virtue of the natural connexion and *concomitance*, whereby the parts of the risen Lord are knit together, the body is there under the form of wine and the blood under the form of bread and the soul under both. Moreover the Godhead is there in consequence of the admirable hypostatic union between IT and the body and soul. Wherefore it is most true that as much (tantumdem) is contained under either form as under both. For the whole and entire Christ exists under the species (kind) of bread and every part of that species, and whole also under the species of wine and under the parts of it.’... Mr Cobb explains, &c., &c., emphatic disclaimer of a natural sensible corporeal presence—declaration of a wholly supernatural transcendental celestial presence! Mr Cobb’s... confusion between a presence and the mode of a presence... Cat. ad Parochos, Pt. II. c. IV. Qn. 17. ‘Since we observe that bread and wine are every day changed by the force of nature into human flesh and blood we may the more easily be led to believe that the substances of bread and wine are converted into the *true* flesh of Christ and *His true* blood by ‘Heavenly benediction.’ Portion XXII. ‘Three most admirable effects wrought by consecration in this holy sacrament. I. That the *true* body of the Lord Christ—that same, which born of the virgin is seated at the right hand of God, is contained in this sacrament; not that the very body is taken, and comes down, from Heaven’ (the opinion of the Franciscans) ‘but that the bread itself and the wine are transmuted into the body and blood of Christ.’... 227. ‘Are bones nerves and whatsoever things pertain to the perfection of man really present here together with the Godhead?’ The answer is meant to shew not only that it is, but that it must be so. ‘The pastor must teach that Christ is the name of God and man: i.e. of One Person, in Whom the Divine and human natures are united together: wherefore it includes each substance, the Godhead and the whole human nature, which consists of the soul and of all parts of the body and also the blood—all which must be believed to be in the sacrament. For since in Heaven the whole manhood is united to the Godhead in one person and hypostasis, it may not be suspected that the body which is in the sacrament is separated from the same Godhead.’

It seems impossible to state more clearly that the substance which after consecration takes the place of the substances of bread and wine does not and cannot exist apart from its *consequentia*, which include all things pertaining to the completeness of human nature, as bones and nerves: in other words, the body in its full integrity ... Fuller explanation of the mode of the presence. Bellarmine, 2nd Rule de Sac. Euch. 'We say indeed that the body of Christ, 'as it is in the Eucharist, is true real natural animate quantitative 'coloured, &c. ; and we shall call that flesh *corporeal not spiritual* ' (unless the word spiritual be taken as 1 Cor. xxi.). But *we shall* 'not say that the body of Christ in the eucharist is sensible visible 'tangible *extended*, although in Heaven it is such.' In his third rule about adverbs he observes, 'We shall say that Christ is in the 'eucharist *truly really substantially*, as the council rightly says, 'but we shall not say corporeally, *i.e.* in that manner in which 'bodies exist of their own nature sensibly movably, &c.' ... The doctrine of transubstantiation is clearly *not that* which excites Mr Cobb's enthusiastic admiration. Nothing short of this would satisfy a devout catholic.

P. 226. 'The faithful can never sufficiently admire the perfection of holy church and her height of glory, &c. This we have 'in common with the dwellers in Heaven—that *both* have Christ, 'God and man, present... *The only difference...* we adore Him,... 'withdrawn from the sense of the eyes, *concealing Himself under* 'the admirable covering of the sacred mysteries.' Qn. 28. It would have been shocking to eat human flesh and to drink human blood."

Bp Thirlwall adds, "All is clear and consistent."

*Note.* It seems to me that a question here arises respecting these two modes of the existence of one body. Is it philosophically tenable or acceptable? We have no single fact in the whole range of philosophy in its broadest acceptation to favour it. Nor is there any other asserted in Holy Writ. If then it be directly contrary to our ideas of a body, why is it allowable to put a strain upon physical science by accepting this sole instance? For all this—be it remembered—is required of us simply to escape giving a tropical interpretation to "This is My body," &c.,—clauses which in their position may be taken tropically. The Bishop interprets the papal documents unexceptionally. But the Roman scheme of interpretation may not the less be arbitrary and erroneous.



(K.) DEAN GOULBURN.

*On Personal Religion.* London, 1863.

P. 18. "If the eucharist were merely...a commemorative rite—if the whole design of the ordinance was to affect us with a picture of our Lord's passion, &c.: but the Lord's supper is... *an actual channel or vehicle of grace* to the soul. It stands on the same footing in this respect with prayer, reading of Scripture, public worship and sermons. Only we believe that it takes precedence of them all, as *the instrument of a higher grace* and a means of a closer communion with God...Fellowship and 'breaking of bread' put as the Lord's supper. If the breaking of bread be *the distinctively Christian ordinance*—yea as communicating to the soul not indeed by a carnal transubstantiation but 'after an 'Heavenly and spiritual manner'...the *very body and blood* of our crucified Redeemer, &c. &c.

P. 120. "If all we sought in the eucharist were a certain *natural* sensibility to the death of Christ, which death the ordinance is appointed to shew forth...But I seek much more in the eucharist than to look at a picture and be touched. I seek to be fed in that holy ordinance *through* the elements of bread and wine with that flesh which is meat indeed, &c.

P. 121. "In devout minds which have been reared under the old system of things there is *an instinct adverse* to very frequent communion, &c. There is something dreadful in the thought of so high an ordinance degenerating into formality; and degenerate into formality *it certainly must*, unless contemporaneously...there should be a general raising of the tone of the recipients' character and conduct.

P. 123. "What are the materials out of which Christ framed the highest rite of His holy religion? Did He prescribe a costly sacrifice? He blessed a common meal and consecrated it into a sacrament, and *made it the means* (by a marvellous mystery of Divine grace) of communicating Himself to man's soul.

P. 126. Romanists—Their unscriptural tenet of transubstantiation, *giving as it does a false awfulness* and a superstitious mysteriousness to the ordinance, frightens them away and holds them back from frequent communion. Quotes Monod, but objects to his recommendation of daily communion, "If it should be every Sunday at least, what should it be at most? At most must be to take it, as the ancients did, &c. every day from house to house [*i.e.* first in one house, then another time in another; or "in a house," *κατ' οίκον*] at the close of the family repast" [after the agape or love feast, the free common meal]. M. quotes Calvin and the Acts, and adds, "Frequent communions make us understand

much better the true character of this sacrament: and it is impossible that daily communion should fail to put us in perfect possession of that true character. For it teaches us to connect the communion with all that there is most simple in Christian life, just as a repast is one of the simplest things in ordinary life."

*On the Communion Office.* London, 1863.

"The whole history of the Lord's supper, culminating as it does in the heresy of transubstantiation, shews a sad tendency in the human mind to localize and materialize the blessings of this ordinance. I mean by localizing and materializing the blessing the placing of it entirely in the outward and visible sign—the *imagining some mysterious charm*—a virtue half physical, half spiritual, to reside in the crumbs of bread and in the drops of wine. The Laudian doctrine of consecration is quite as much open to the charge as the bolder and more unreasonable error of the Church of Rome. And there can be no doubt that many members of our own communion, in the views they take of the subject, attach the blessing far too little to the ordinance itself, and far too exclusively to the sensible magic vehicle of the ordinance. [See on this point Neander regarding the doctrine prevalent in the fourth century on the sacraments.] The mysterious operation upon the bread and wine, by which they are sanctified for their high significance and office, engrosses in their minds the whole field of view; and the operations of it upon the human spirit, which the ordinance is designed to call forth and develope, go for nothing in their estimate. The natural superstitiousness of the human heart (for it is most superstitious) gathers round the material and local, and the mental and the moral are thrown quite into the background....His sacred body was *the source* of natural health to thousands of poor patients who touched it [Here is the favourite doctrine of Cyril of Alexandria again. Had he said the body was an instrument or even a channel in which the blessing came from the Son of God's Divine nature or from the Father—but to make the body *the source*, is, I think, groundless and dangerous] and His teaching was the sanctifying Spirit to those who listened to it; but supposing that in those days some of the disciples had attached to the mere body of our Lord, independently of any action of mind on the part of those who heard Him and applied to Him, the blessing of His presence in the world—supposing they had heeded scarcely at all the gracious words which fell from His lips, and had imagined that the mere fact of His neighbourhood in the body would prove a sort of talisman of health to the whole district in which He sojourned, would He not most seriously have reproved such notions?

P. 133. "We need not deny, rather we would clearly and strongly affirm, that they are not mere symbols, but *stand in some*

*real though mysterious relation to the blessing of the ordinance.* Yet we say that the blessing is not to be materialized, or supposed to reside in the elements after the manner of a charm.

P. 135. "It was necessary to disabuse men's minds utterly of the figment, that the bread and wine become in a gross and carnal sense the body and blood of Christ, and also of the kindred notion that they were talismans that would exercise a spiritual virtue, independent of the faith of the recipient. Any allusion therefore to *the action of the Spirit and word* upon the elements, or to their becoming the body and blood of Christ (however capable of justification by Scripture (?) and primitive usage) it was *thought safe* to expunge, and simply to ask God for His blessing on the ordinance—without prescribing to Him *the manner* in which that blessing is to be realized to us, how *the blessing* is a *real and true* participation of the body and blood of Christ.

P. 137. "Who shall say *how* Christ communicates *Himself* in the supper to the faithful soul? We are totally in the dark as to these spiritual operations. [What if there be not one ray of scriptural authority for the coming of the Spirit upon the elements, to make *any* real and true presence of Christ's body and blood? We must not *then* any more link this unreal carnal miracle with spiritual things, and make the unseen action of God's Deity on the soul a sort of plea or half plea for believing in a carnal reception at all.] The precise nature of *the spiritual operation* is clothed in mystery.

P. 141. "'One bread,' one cake or loaf—The sacred loaf, which represents *and conveys the body of Christ*, is one; and a portion of it after it has been broken, passes into each communicant, who hereupon is made one with the body of Christ or Christian society.

P. 150. "The rationalizing view of the Lord's supper acknowledges no mystery in the transmission. No one denies that *a communication* [of bread and wine] is the great object of the holy communion. But the divines whose views we have been considering maintain this to have been its exclusive object: and that this account of the ordinance exhausts the subject, &c. [Incorrect inasmuch as they do fully believe in the seeking and obtaining of grace from God direct in the use of the ordinance.]

P. 102. "Now had it been other than a Paul, we might think their view capable of a tolerable reconciliation with holy Scripture. He however was appointed of God to bring out more clearly and define more exactly the word of institution which His Divine Master employed, &c. The cup of blessing, &c. He does not say, Is it not a figure or representation of the body and blood of Christ? Is it not a communication of a sign of participating in the body and blood of Christ?

P. 153. "Thus the view that the eucharistic rite is simply communicative is excluded at once and for ever by the plain language of the apostle Paul [*i.e.* Just because St Paul does not say "Don't you see it is a figure?" therefore we are *for ever* precluded from arguing that it has a figurative sense and that no real and true presence of Christ's body is signified. Would any one then have doubted that it was figurative? "What and if ye shall "see, &c." was now changed into "Ye have seen My body going up "to Heaven not to return till the restitution of all things." How *then* could they think the bread was His body and the wine His blood in any but a figurative meaning? If so, why should he explain this to them?] And *our church* in the catechism 'Body 'and blood of Christ is verily and indeed *taken and received*' not an empty figure and vain ceremony [a pregnant figure certainly but so far empty that Christ's natural body is not in it]. And Art. The bread is a partaking of the body of Christ, &c. [as figurative as the original words of Paul].

P. 159. "The elements are the memorial of our consecration with the in some way altogether mysterious supersensual Heavenly and Divine—not to be comprehended by human reason and therefore not to be explained by human definitions [as much of this as you will in relation to the soul and what it receives of a spiritual nature, but why bring in the reception of Christ's natural body?]. If we are to be asked what it is that gives *the elements this character*, the answer is, beyond the shadow of a doubt, the consecration. Why should we be afraid of the precise and admirable language of our own 28th Article, 'The body of Christ is given in the supper, &c.'? [Ans. Only because the Dean adds] The giving *must be by consecration*. [The Dean takes the words as concerning Christ's natural body which our Church denies and even adds to this clause in this article] *only* after an Heavenly and spiritual manner [*i.e.* not natural flesh and blood—such as is *said to be* produced by consecration. For if it is figurative of spiritual blessings to be received by them, the elements want no consecrating to make them figurative. They are so]. The mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten (not given only but received and eaten) in the supper is faith. [The Dean's parenthesis shews that he believes Christ's body to be naturally taken and eaten because otherwise there is no difference in force between its being given and its being taken and eaten.]

P. 231. Appendix. "If there is in the human mind a tendency which has made itself only too manifest in the history of the church to crave after the bodily visible presence of our Lord, who can doubt that this tendency is at the bottom of the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation? It is very easy to rail at Transubstantiation in the ordinary coarse way, &c. But surely it may

be better far to consider whether there is some instinct in the fallen mind, which *may have prompted* their fatal errors, and whether we ourselves are not apt to be *misled by the same instinct* in another form. Transubstantiation is that, on the utterance by the priest of the words of consecration, *He is drawn down into* the church, and lies concealed under the consecrated elements, &c.

P. 240. "The Lord is supposed to be among His people as heretofore—as heretofore to occupy a certain space upon earth to the exclusion of all other parts of space—as heretofore (although in a great mystery) to be the subject of sight and touch.

P. 244. "What could the bodily presence of Christ under our roofs in our churches do for us which He is at present unable to do?

P. 246. "We must dismiss all notions of Him which would reduce Him again under limited conditions—which it pleased Him once to assume—of an earthly body and a natural relationship... Let us find Him in our hearts by the motions and instigations of His Spirit. There let us hold communion with Him. He is not far from every one of us, He is a God nigh at hand, and the way to Him is easy." [This last part, which is written on John iv. and Matt. viii., it is delightful to transcribe.]

(L.) DR J. P. LANGE.

*Com. edited by Dr P. Schaff. Edinburgh, 1872.*

John vi. 62, 63. "Three views (have been held). I. No bearing direct or indirect on the sacrament of the Lord's supper. II. It refers, by prophetic anticipation, directly and exclusively to the Lord's supper. This interpretation has consistently led to the introduction of infant communion, &c. III. It refers to the spiritual life-union of the soul with the Saviour by faith; and indirectly or inferentially to the sacramental celebration of this union in the holy supper. *Bengel.* Jesus purposely framed His words so skilfully... that they would apply in their strict literal sense to the spiritual enjoyment of Himself: and yet that afterwards the same words should (by consequence) be appropriate to express the most august mystery of the holy supper when that should be instituted... The whole of these words concerning His flesh and blood have in view the passion of Jesus Christ, and along with it the Lord's supper. *Olshausen.* The Saviour could not indeed with propriety speak of a rite before it was instituted—so that nobody could understand Him—but He might touch the *idea* out of which the rite subsequently grew. *Alford.* *Is the subject, here dwelt upon, the*

*same as that which is set forth in the ordinance of the Lord's supper?* And of this there can surely be no doubt. *Webster and Wilkinson.* What our Lord said at this time He afterwards expressed in a permanent form by the sacrament of His body and blood. He is not here alluding to that sacrament; but what He here teaches and what He afterwards taught by it are the same. *Kahn's.* The discourse of Christ does not treat directly of the Lord's supper, but of the faith which unites us in living union with Christ. *Godet.* This mystery of our perfect union with the person of Christ (Eph. v. 30—32), which in this discourse is expressed in words [en paroles], is precisely the same which Jesus desired to express by an act [par un acte] in the rite of the holy supper. [Dr Schaff quotes more: but this may suffice on *this one point.*]

I do not concur with Dr Schaff's doctrine, the mystery of a spiritual real presence, and a communication of the *vital power* of Christ's *humanity* (σάρξ) to the believer by the Holy Spirit. On the contrary I believe that no vital power ever proceeded from Christ's flesh itself as the starting-point of vital power, but from the Godhead dwelling in that flesh in connexion with the human spirit. "The flesh (alone) profiteth not at all."

P. 225. "Romanist and (symbolical) Lutherans agree in teaching that unbelievers as well as believers may sacramentally eat the very body and drink the very blood of Christ—the one unto judgment the others unto life. Note. Luther, Melanchthon and the orthodox Lutherans of the 17th century felt this; and for this reason they repudiated the sacramental interpretation [of this chapter] altogether; not as Tholuck says from fear of transubstantiation."

It seems to me that both transubstantiation and consubstantiation are clearly excluded (1) by the canon of interpretation laid down in v. 63; (2) by the declaration of our Lord concerning the *effect* of the fruition of His body and blood; which is in all cases eternal life, vv. 54—58. Dr Schaff means that if the elements are transubstantiated, good and bad receive them so transubstantiated, and if the effect of the real body and blood is eternal life, then both righteous and wicked recipients have life eternal, and therefore the very body and blood are not *given* and are not there to be given. Q. E. D.

(M.) CANON THOMAS S. L. VOGAN, D.D.

This gentleman was a Rector in the diocese of Chichester, R. D. and a proctor in convocation. His style commends itself. It is of that kind that almost persuades you that he must be nearly right, when you are most firmly persuaded of the incorrectness of his premisses or of his inferences or both. However, whoever has waded through Dr Pusey's thickest book and emerged with his understanding unclouded, need not despair of knowing what his own views are, even after having submitted himself to the gentle witchery of Dr Vogan's artillery of short antithetic clauses. I must beg all to excuse any strength of utterance into which the vast importance of the subject may have driven me. I seem to myself to see as little of his views in the authoritative formularies of the Church of England, as of those of the Ritualist, or Tractarians. After pondering with full leisure a much larger portion of all that has been written on this subject than I ever hoped to run over and weigh, I am landed I think for ever in the conclusion, that the Church of England Articles as a dogmatic statement, and her communion service as a statement of a rhetorical nature, come perhaps as near to the teaching of Christ and Paul on this subject as a body of Christians can ever be hoped to do: and I for one assign it in chief under God to Cranmer's unusual powers and extraordinary patience.

The question now arises, Does Dr Vogan hold the altar priest and sacrifice theory of the Lord's supper? And there is no logical answer to it but that he does. For altar priest and sacrifice, as he exceedingly well reasons, are correlatives; if there is one there is all the rest. If then we take the words, "This is My body" "which is given for you" in the only logical sense, and make the latter part of it mean, "which is being given," i.e. is in process of being given to die on the cross, since the preliminary steps are taken, then the first two (Greek) words, "This thing" (bread) "is" must logically mean one of two things; either, This is a sacred sign or sacrament of My body, or This bread is My true natural body. All varieties of explanations merge in these two, and Dr Vogan, as he rejects the first, must needs drop into the latter. All senses of the sort, that this bread puts you in possession of all the spiritual blessings that follow, range themselves under the first sense, The bread is the index or sign of your possessing all

these things. It is the pledge, the earnest that you, if you believe, have them. But once hold fast to the literal sense of the word "is," and the bodily presence of Christ in the bread is logically asserted, and the inflowing difficulties must be met as they can. Better take Protestant arms against such a sea of confusions, and by opposing end them.

He takes the Protestant side again, p. xi. "His dead body is nowhere to be found; His poured-out blood is nowhere to be found. In most certain and absolute fact and reality they are not. And that which is not, cannot be present anywhere. The dead body of the Lord and His blood shed cannot be, and therefore are not, present either in the eucharist or in its elements. [Then how are they there except in a figure? Then what becomes of the literal sense for which Dr Vogan just now contended? But hear him again.]

Chapter x. 102. "The literal interpretation vindicated, p. 103. In the words 'which is given for you,' 'given' means of necessity 'given to God,' '*offered*' in sacrifice to *Him* for 'the sins of men.' ...His body is sacrificed, His body dead.

P. 104. "In His risen and glorified state it is impossible for the body and blood to be separated. [This implies that Christ's body and blood were really separated when He died, which cannot be conceded. In a word they were given separately only in a figure, in a figurative way. Then he says most truly,] All the subtle metaphysics (Bellarmine, Newman and Archdeacon Wilberforce) which have been employed to prove that it (Christ's body) can be in Heaven unmoved at the right hand of God, and yet can also be in thousands of places upon the earth, &c. &c. All is to no purpose. If these things were proved, it would be labour in vain, since our Lord speaks not of His glorified body, &c. He speaks of His dead body ... This it is which His words declare, which He gave to the disciples, which He told them to take and eat... Dr Pusey has recited authorities on the real objective presence in the eucharist ... These authorities prove undoubtedly and most fully *a real objective presence*, in a certain sense, of our Lord's body and blood, *i.e.* of the things which He called and ordained to be sacramentally His body and blood, &c. [Is it not an illogical use of terms to say a real objective presence, &c., if he does not mean that in some way, to the mouth of the recipient or to his soul, the real objective body and blood of Christ are given in his literal sense? But he adds,] The true nature and effect of these authorities will be considered in another place. [But again Dr Vogan states his aim,] 'The *literal* interpretation of our Lord's 'words in the institution is of the given body of the crucified slain



'dead body.' [So p. 92.] The Church of Rome declares this doctrine of the Real Presence in the bread and wine is set forth in the words of our Lord 'in their proper and most real signification.' Luther said that, 'as far as can be done,' &c. &c. Dr Pusey says, 'All things combine to make us take our Lord's words...literally.' Archdeacon Wilberforce, 'to be taken in their simple and natural sense—the belief of all ancient writers.' Bishop Moberley says, 'real and exact sense.' [Dr Vogan says] This demand of a literal construction is just. I join in it and accept the reasons on which it is founded. [Does not this agree with p. ix. of the Preface, "Nor is the literal interpretation, This represents or is a figure of "My body, My blood"? And how is all this anything but opposite to the Protestant sense?

*The true doctrine of the holy Eucharist.* London, 1871.

Preface, p. viii. "The whole of the record [*i.e.* the narration of the Lord's supper in the New Testament] must be taken for the subject of *the literal interpretation*, which is demanded [by Dr Vogan, or by the truth in Dr Vogan's view] ... and there can be as little doubt that the literal interpretation of the record must be under these rules: first that it shall not exclude any part of the letter [Granted], nor include anything beyond it or that is not necessarily in *strict* construction deduced from it. [Do the words *strict* construction exclude a metaphoric sense?] Secondly and thirdly, &c. &c. [P. ix.] The records say that when He gave the bread He said, Take, eat; This is My body: and that when He gave the cup He said, This is My blood. And the literal interpretation of this is not 'This contains,' &c., &c.: but 'This—is—My body, This—is—My blood.' *Nor is* the literal interpretation [the following] 'This represents or is a figure of My body, My blood' [*i.e.* Dr Vogan expressly denies the figurative sense and affirms the literal, for he next concludes the paragraph saying] The letter, and the interpretation of that letter is (are) that the bread—is—the body: and that the wine—is—the blood of Christ. And He said not these words only; but of that body He said, It was 'being given or broken for you' and of that blood He said, It was 'being shed for you.' 'This is My body which is being given for you.' 'This is My blood which is being shed for you for the remission of sins'... As the bread and the wine were distinct things and were given separately from each other, so He gave His body and blood separately from each other. [Thirteen lines higher he explains "given" as "given to God": now he says that body and blood were "given" separately. This fails in sense unless it means that both are literally given to us, or else that they were "given" separately to God—which is not true.] And it was His dead body which He gave. [Then p. x.] The bread and the wine are the body and blood of Christ, *so far as one thing can be another.*

[If this has any logical meaning it is not true that one thing can be another except by representation or in a figure, *i.e.* the bread is not the body of Christ in any but a representative or figurative way, or the wine His blood; *i.e.* the literal interpretation does not hold: but Dr Vogan said, "The literal interpretation is "demanded." These things are contrary the one to the other, and Euclid used to say this in a shorter form of words. He then goes with his latter utterance which is in effect the Protestant interpretation, adding, "The wine is His blood poured out; the bread is "His body given ... but both in *spiritual effect*, not in positive and "absolute reality."]

Chapter 14. *The ancient fathers.* P. 147. "This part of Dr Pusey's work is largely made of passages (as) little pertinent to the purpose. In fact I find that fully one-half in number and much more in bulk of the passages he has cited, &c. &c. are quite inapplicable. [This I am constrained to reiterate. It seems to me *one* of the very bewildering features of the book. It makes you require to be armed with a judge's patience to be sure that you do not let slip some remark which is to the purpose, while you let the current of irrelevant matter run by.]

P. 150. "It is a negation of His (Christ's) glorified body to speak of its blood being shed [*i.e.* now]. When they (the fathers) talk of the real presence they must mean the real presence of our Lord's glorified body not only under the bread (as its form) but also under the wine (as its form): because the blood of the glorified body is not, nor can be, nor can be conceived to be shed or separated from it. [This is an indisputable argument against the presence of Christ's living body, either natural or glorified. Granted. But what then? Our inference is against any real presence of Christ's body at all, *ἡ σὰρξ οὐκ ὠφέλει οὐδέν*. Whereas Dr Vogan draws from it a literal presence, and will not allow that the body and blood are present only in a figure. And so he says, This is My body, &c., This is My blood, &c., by a literal interpretation. And he does not appear to see that in his interpretation of its being a dead body, &c. &c. (for I do not like talking of these details) which is given, &c. &c. it is just as difficult to have the blood distinct and separate from the body. But with any literal sense it must be: and therefore we feel very content with our taking the blood and the body as two figures of spiritual food. Figures may be divided. The body in one figure may be severed from the blood in another figure: but in the literal sense, whether with a living or a dead body, it is simply inconceivable. And why, once more, should a figurative meaning be so resolutely denied to these words? Thousands of clauses in Scripture are admitted to be figurative. Why not these?]

Once more, p. 151. "They (the ancient fathers) understood

our Lord's words in the sense which He intended, and which only, faith can accept. Since He said of the bread, This is My body, they believed that the bread is His body, but with His own explanation, which is given for you; and therefore that the bread is His body as a sacrifice, His dead body." [Logic says His body was a sacrifice, and the bread was not His body living or dead. And that not the bread but the body was given on the cross, and, to vary Dr Vogan's expression in the preface, one thing cannot be or be conceived another thing. The body and the bread are not the very same and cannot bear identical relations, but can be related by the one being a figure of the other. It is against this impossibility of identification that all advocates of any real bodily presence have been struggling in vain for near 1800 years, and all the forces of supernatural miracle have not achieved it, neither can Dr Vogan's idea of a dead body and the blood of a dead body departed from each other attain even to verisimilitude. The only reasonable or tenable or probable or endurable theory is that He gave His body and shed His blood on the cross, and that He gave the bread and the wine anticipatively in the upper room, and ordered these signs to be used for ever in remembrance of the gift of His body and blood on the cross. Dr Vogan's idea of a dead Christ literally given, and that the bread and wine really are Christ's dead body and blood, as far as one thing can be another, is no new theory as in one point he seems to believe. The theory has come out in these extracts, and this had not escaped the late Dean of Ripon, Dr William Goode. The sentence above cited ends thus] "And 'since He said of the wine, This is My blood, they believed that the 'wine is His blood: but again with His own explanation 'which is "'shed for you,' and therefore that the wine is His blood, *separated from His body*" [which never took place but very partially, and that part was spilt on the ground].

(N.) THE REV. HOBART SEYMOUR, BATH. D. 1874.

Author of "Mornings with the Jesuits."

*Frequent Celebrations and frequent Communions.* London, 1870.

P. 1. "A revolution is advancing with great rapidity among us, &c.; the idea that the frequency of attendance at the Lord's supper is a precious and weighty engine of grace, for converting the communicant and advancing the growth of religious life in the soul, &c. The subject needs to be handled in a becoming spirit, gently and lovingly and tenderly, but still faithfully, &c.

P. 7. "The argument stands out in strong relief, that, as the Lord's supper is a sacrament and a means of grace, it cannot be sought too often, &c. This argument *seems* wholly unanswerable,

unless indeed by bearing in mind, that the argument which proves too much may be regarded as an argument that proves nothing, &c.: the argument, if it proves anything at all, proves that the yearly communion should be a monthly one; that the monthly communion should be a weekly one; that the weekly communion should become a daily one; that the daily communion should like our morning and evening prayer become a morning and evening one; and this too on the part of every Christian man.

P. 12. "In the 40 days, Acts i. 3 ... there must have been no less than 6 sabbath days, &c.: and although it is evident that the disciples and especially the apostles were often assembled together there is no allusion to the communion of the Lord's supper. There is no more said of it than if it had never been celebrated through all these six weeks, &c. The silence is absolute evidence that the Holy Ghost, Who inspired the history, did not deem the celebration of the communion of so much importance as to require narration, &c. This omission, &c., forms a striking contrast with the writings of some of our modern divines, &c.

P. 13. "In the interval between the ascension of our Lord and the descent of the Holy Ghost, &c. there is no mention of the communion, Acts i. 14, 15, &c. On one of those hallowed meetings, &c., they did elect Matthias into the apostleship, &c., they are described as doing all this with prayer. There is no mention of the communion. And when again, &c. they are described as having all assembled together on the day of Pentecost, &c., there is no mention of the communion.

P. 14. "The Holy Ghost did not regard the frequent celebration of the Lord's supper as so much in the essence of Christianity as it is deemed by many ... The great period of the church's history from the day of Pentecost to St Paul's imprisonment at Rome, &c.; in no instance whatever is there any clear mention or certain allusion to the celebration of the Lord's supper. When they were assembled to elect the seven deacons there is no mention of a communion. When the whole church assembled at Jerusalem, Acts xv., at the first council there is no mention of a communion. [Question of "breaking bread" discussed (see Part I.).]

P. 22. "There is only one epistle (of 22) in which there is reference to this subject.

P. 23. "The moment we leave the Holy Scriptures and open the writings of the second, third, and fourth centuries we pass from a reign of silence to one in which there is no limit to the information, &c., on the frequency of communion, &c. &c. Pliny, Justin M., Tertullian, Cyprian, Augustine, &c. &c.

P. 25. "The Church of Rome has no desire for frequent communions. Her desire is for frequent celebrations. She is satisfied with one personal communion in the year, holding that the

members of each congregation do virtually communicate by a sort of proxy in the priest that celebrates the mass.

P. 28. "There is another evil connected with these frequent celebrations, &c. It is clear that the preaching of the Gospel must be sadly curtailed, &c. &c. There is not time for both: and already too many of the clergy make the communion an excuse for not preaching on the days of celebration.

P. 29. "In the Holy Scriptures inspired by the Holy Ghost the work of the ministry, as exhibited in the life of Christ Himself and in the Acts of the Apostles, was the blessed work of preaching the Gospel. In the minds of some men in these days it is the celebration of the communion.

P. 5. "In all this diversity of principles and practice one thing stands out clearly, *viz.* that the number of celebrations (we do not like the word, but it serves our present purpose) must be sufficient for the convenience and exigencies of the parishioners, and should be arranged at such times as their special necessities require, *i.e.* in the morning, the afternoon or the evening."

I have not liked to interrupt this venerable writer, as it did not seem necessary; but now that his testimony has been given, I may add that his argument from p. 7 stops short by one stage at least of the point to which it might be carried. He argues that if the observance of this rite cannot be too frequent for our benefit it may be brought up to being administered twice every Sunday as at morning and evening prayer: but the argument if allowed its own course would come in town churches to three times on every Sunday, *i.e.* morning, afternoon and evening; and to this would be added early morning, which is very convenient for some: which makes up four times every Sunday, and for every Christian to attend as often as he can. Nor if this principle be allowed full play, would this frequency stop with Sunday. No reason on this principle can be assigned why it should not be administered two or three times, if not four, every day. So that it becomes a question whether its high solemnity and blessedness may not suffer from too great frequency: and whether there is not some middle course which will produce the maximum of impression on the mind and heart.

I have omitted Mr Seymour's remarks on St Paul because he does not quote "As often as ye eat, &c." *ὡς ἄκις ἀν ἐσθίητε, κ.τ.λ.*, which seems to imply a wish for a much more frequent use than "once a year." "As often soever as ye may eat this flesh and "drink this cup."

(O.) DR G. A. JACOB, LATE HEAD MASTER OF CHRIST'S  
HOSPITAL.

*The ecclesiastical polity of the New Testament.* London, 1871.

P. 340. "On looking then to the Apostolic church of the New Testament ... two great primary lessons are at once presented to us by the ecclesiastical polity of the apostles... These ... relate to the ministry and the sacraments of the church: and they teach us that *sacerdotalism* and *sacramentalism* had no place in the apostles' practice or encouragement from their authority: and consequently a return to the purity of the primitive church will lead to the exclusion of these *post-apostolic* errors.

P. 342. "Altars having even in the reign of Edward VI. given way to 'honest tables' in our churches, while the word 'altar' itself has been carefully expunged from our prayer-book—and the idea of a *material sacrifice* having been removed *from all prescribed acts* of our officiating ministers, it needs only a completion of this good work to remove also whatever encourages the thought that a Christian presbyter is a priest [see on this an extract from Fulke] and as such possesses the power of granting priestly absolution, *of offering sacrifices*, or of performing any other mediatorial work for Christian men.

P. 346. "He who is directed to forgive sins or to withhold forgiveness may reasonably urge the consequent necessity of individual confession to himself, or as it is commonly called 'auricular confession': and he who is expressly declared to be a priest cannot by any explanations be prevented from making for himself an altar and a sacrifice, though none be provided for him in the church.

P. 347. Sacramentalism. "There has been at all times a close connexion between the estimation and use of the Christian sacraments and the views entertained of the Christian ministry... Sacramentalism—or an excessive unscriptural and therefore superstitious exaltation of the sacraments... From and after the beginning of the third century the sacrament [of Baptism] was overloaded with a burden of ceremonies before unknown, all tending but too surely to produce the belief that a special virtue was conveyed into the water, and that it washed away sin by a supernatural efficacy of its own. The consecrated ointment, &c. &c.

P. 348. "In like manner the sacrament of the Lord's supper was the most simple of all ordinances in the apostolic church. No

*idea of a sacrifice* was attached to its celebration: *no change* was supposed to take place in the sacred elements: no virtue to be imparted *to them* through the administrator: no presence of Christ in them or with them in any especial or peculiar manner. [Christ's Godhead peculiarly there but not His body naturally.] But in the post-apostolic church all this was gradually changed, until at last the service was represented as a sacrifice offered upon an altar by a priest: the elements were spoken of and worshipped as if they were Christ Himself. And other gross superstitions naturally ensued.

P. 314. "It is in vain that Protestant advocates have endeavoured to rescue the Nicæne church [the church of the Fourth Century] from the charge of gross superstition in their dealings with this sacred rite [see too the oriental liturgies] and to fasten the doctrine of transubstantiation upon the later Church of Rome alone. The doctrine of the earlier period differed from mediæval Romanism on this point in scarcely anything *beyond the use* of another and synonymous word. In the fourth century the change in the eucharistic bread and wine was called (as in the case of the baptismal water) 'transelementation.' And is it possible to say what real or important distinction there is between the earlier and the later word? &c. &c. [N.B. Dr Jacob does not affirm that there are not *many* virtual synonymous or equivalent expressions as well as this one.]

P. 364. "The use of æsthetic stimulants to devotion appealing to the senses and imagination by means of architectural ornamentation pictures images processions crosses and other symbolical objects, or of histrionic displays of ministerial acts with vestments incense artificial lights prostrations and fantastic gestures and with the whole array of priestcraft—which now as in ancient times beguile the ignorant and unwary—will be seen to be not only no aids to Christian doctrine and devotion, but *positive hindrances* to them. Since in proportion as such things answer the purpose for which they are intended, and engage the attention and affect the feelings, to the same extent do they shut out gospel truth and hide Christ from the spirit of the worshipper.

P. 365. "There will be less danger of our trusting to sacraments instead of to Christ—of our putting baptism with water for regeneration by the Holy Spirit—and the eucharistic elements received into our hands or our mouths for the Saviour received into our hearts—less danger of our shrinking from the Lord's table with superstitious dread, or with equally superstitious confidence trusting to (a) coming to it in vain."

(P.) THE REV. WHARTON MARRIOTT, OF ETON SCHOOL.

*Life and Letters.*

A Letter, January 1, 1859. "The Passover again, regarded as a piacular sacrifice, such as was the first passover in Egypt, was fulfilled once for all in the death upon the cross of the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world. But considered as a *memorial* sacrifice such as were all the passovers but the first, it has its 'fulfilment,' as our Lord Himself intimates, Luke xxii. 16, in the Christian memorial of Christ's death and passion, in accordance with those emphatic words, twice repeated, 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25, 'This do in remembrance of Me.' And thus, partly in the one sacrifice of the cross, partly also in the Christian memorial of that sacrifice, the passover is not destroyed but fulfilled."

The care with which this author avoids calling the Lord's supper a sacrifice is the more notable for two reasons; (1) that he must have been well acquainted with St Augustine's hasty utterance which asserts that "a commemoration of a sacrifice" and "a commemorative sacrifice" are identical expressions, and (2) that to have agreed with this unhappy utterance of Augustine would have added a seeming additional force to Mr Wharton's argumentation against Professor Powell. Almost the whole of Mr Marriott's book is in complete harmony with this letter. It is only in his rough sketch of his contemplated future lectures that any divergence is traceable.

*On the words ποιείτε τοῦτο*, Matt. xxvi. &c. "*Do this*," &c.

P. 196. "And thus we are brought to the following canon of interpretation applicable to all language as such, whether inspired or uninspired; that an ordinary word of well-known meaning is to be understood in that its ordinary meaning, unless there be something in the context or in the circumstances of the case, by which that ordinary sense is excluded... Precisely the same principle of criticism applies to the attempt which has been often made to give to ἀνάμνησις, [remembering], the meaning which is proper to μνήμωσιν [memorial], &c.

P. 207. "May we not in this see a special fitness in the word καταγγέλλετε [ye declare] 'as often as ye eat this bread or drink 'this cup, ye hand down from one to another the announcement of 'the Lord's death till He come'?... That καταγγέλλω means of itself to 'shew forth in the way of sacrifice to God,' or that there is anything in the context of this passage which proves that the way of 'announcement' there spoken of by the apostle was a true



and proper sacrifice 'on behalf of quick and dead' and for the children yet unborn I think I may most unhesitatingly most confidentially deny. Nor can I check one word of earnest entreaty to those among ourselves, who ... have suffered themselves to build up and to commend to the acceptance of the church a system of doctrines on this subject (based upon supposed premises of Holy Scripture) which are no sooner examined than they crumble away beneath the hand.

P. 216. "The word 'is' simply serves to join the two parts of the sentence together, whether there be a figure or no. It simply expresses that the two ideas thus compared bear a certain relation to one another ... this certain relation ... is infinitely varied in kind and can in no case be determined without reference to the nature of the proposition in which it occurs, in some cases only by taking into consideration both the entire context of the passage and a great variety of other circumstances."

P. 194. After a long list of instances of *ποιέω* meaning "do sacrifice" from the Greek LXX. translation of the Old Test. and from the New Testament—"Now as I have already intimated the result of a close examination of the above will be considerably to diminish their number. But granting the assertion, for argument's sake as broadly as it is stated, I will ask, How do we know in any one of these cases that the meaning of *ποιέω* is what is asserted? Simply because the context is such as absolutely to exclude the ordinary well-known meaning of the word, and as absolutely to require some such meaning as to offer or to sacrifice. And the fallacy of the argument we are now considering lies in this, that the interpretation of a word in an 'improper' sense, which is allowable, when the context is such as absolutely to require it, is represented as equally allowable when there is nothing in the context or in the circumstances of the case to exclude the ordinary meaning of the word. [This is then illustrated by reference to Exod. x. 25.]

P. 256. "The bread is (virtute et effectu) My body, &c. &c." [Does not Jesus say that His flesh has no virtus aut effectus in itself, when He says *οὐκ ὠφελεῖ οὐδέν* : "it does not profit at all" ?]

(Q.) THE REV. W. E. SCUDAMORE. *Notitia Eucharistica*.  
London, 1872.

(This was written before the Lecture in the Appendix.)

P. 303. "The earliest ordo Romanus represents the clergy vesting before the service begins. According to the same order, and to Amalarius, who comments upon it in 827, the corporal was now (i.e. after the Gospel) put on the altar. The custom was to

spread it, after the offertory anthem had been sung. Thus Rabanus Maurus at Mayence, 'Oblations are offered by the people, and 'the offertory is sung by the clergy, and the pall of the corporal is 'put on the altar.' We trace the custom through Hildebert of Le Mans, 1097, down to Durandus, Bishop of Mende in 1286. The latter says, 'In the meantime, while the priest is washing his 'hands (after the offertory has been sung but before he makes the 'oblation) the deacon arranges the corporal pall on the altar.' Sicardus, Bishop of Cremona 1185, is a witness for the continuance of the custom in Italy during the twelfth century. At Milan it still survives, the *sindon* being put on between the gospel and the oblation. The rite has clearly been preserved by the circumstance that in the Ambrosian missal there is a variable collect said *super sindonem*, when it was spread. In the Greek church the eileton is spread while the catechumens are leaving, and immediately before the first prayers of the faithful. It appears to me that there would be a great advantage in the rule, if it could be introduced among ourselves, that the priest should put on the eucharistic vestments (*i.e.* after preaching the sermon in a surplice), and that the altar should be covered between the Nicene Creed or the sermon and the offertory. It would not only meet some existing inconveniences, but would mark in a very striking manner the beginning of the more sacred part of the holy office.

P. 354. As to mixing water with wine—"One drop is as 'significant as a thousand.' Care was taken that the quantity of water infused did not sensibly affect the taste or diminish the strength of the wine. Hence a small spoon has been used for the mixture in many churches. Note. Merati says that 'the Carthusian monks and nearly all the churches in Germany make use of a small spoon.'

P. 359, sn. 13. The eucharistic fan. "The custom is very ancient, for we find it in the Apostolical Constitutions, 'Let two 'deacons on each side of the altar hold a fan, made of thin membranes or of peacock's feathers or of fine linen, and gently drive 'away the winged insects, that they fall not into the cups.' Note. The asterisk or star is an instrument formed of thin bars of silver crossing each other at right angles in the middle, with the ends all bent in the same direction. This forms a kind of cradle, which is placed, inverted, over the holy bread, to prevent the particles being disordered by the veil. [P. 358. The Greeks use three cloths to cover the sacred elements.] When it is first put over the disk (plate, dish) in the office of the prothesis (side table) the priest says 'And the star came and stood over where 'the young 'child was laid.' Goar, p. 62.

P. 360. "The will of Count Everard made in the year 937 mentions as part of the furniture of his chapel 'one silver fan,' &c.

&c. In the customs of Clugny the Fan is a necessary part of the furniture of the altar, ... to drive them away (flies) from the sacrifice and altar and from the priest himself, &c.

P. 505, § 5. Of the means whereby the consecration is effected. "I. The Church of Rome ascribes the consecration of the elements solely to the recital by the priest of the words of our Lord 'This is My body,' and 'This is the cup of My blood of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many for the remission of sins' (from the Canon of the Mass). Note. Schoolmen generally, 'This is the cup of My blood,' or 'This is My blood,' are of the essence of the consecration of the cup: ... the rest of its integrity. II. Thanksgiving (eucharist) as prominent as prayer ... 'His body and blood through the thanksgiving uttered over them.' Victor of Antioch. III. These thanksgivings so characteristic, that the sacrament itself ... derived ... its most common name from them. IV. Early writers ascribe the consecration to The Word of God and prayers or to the Word alone. 'Receiving The Word of God they become eucharist, i.e. the body and blood of Christ.' Irenæus; [and p. 512, calling on the Holy Ghost to come and touch the gifts] Chrysostom. V. The remarkable statement of Gregory ... the custom of the apostles to consecrate the host of the oblation to that very prayer only. VI. No patristic authority for the mediæval and modern doctrine that ... effected by the sole repetition of our Lord's words. VII. The Council of Florence, nothing inserted in the joint definition."

I have felt it right to curtail to a minimum my notice of Mr Scudamore's seven heads, on what he calls the consecration of the elements—which in his argument includes much more than their being simply set apart for this holy use. It will perhaps be urged by some that Mr Scudamore means no more than the fathers whom he cites; and that they, notwithstanding strong rhetorical expressions, only meant to express just what is the general doctrine of the formularies of the Church of England. But this seems to shew the paramount necessity of coming to a clear and settled decision as to what each father did hold and teach. And the very object of this work is by giving sufficient extracts from each in the original language and in translation, to enable every thoughtful English Christian to judge for himself what each father and great doctor held and taught. It is hard, as it seems to me, to find more than one sentence on this subject in the Common Prayer-Book of the Church of England that cannot be defended as genuinely Protestant. If so Dr Pusey's interpretations of them must

be perversions. Yet the Reverend Doctor expressly said in a letter to the Church Union that was published in several newspapers, that henceforth he should never use a single word to promote his own views on the Lord's supper beyond the words of the Prayer-book, since they contained all that he wished to express and teach. My object on the other hand is chiefly to enable all thoughtful Christians, who can read English or the original languages, to see for themselves whether the language of almost all the fathers is not in a very dangerous degree different from and opposite to the general teaching of the Church of England on many points in relation to the Lord's supper; and in particular on the head and chief point of all, the real presence of Christ's natural body and blood in the supper of the Lord. In so far as this is so, Mr Scudamore by citing any fathers who hold this, means much more by the word consecration than the Church of England. I would beg the reader to turn to the remarks at the head of the extracts from Mr Roundell Palmer, to save my being required to repeat them here.

Mr Scudamore's volume seems to me to be the making up for us a creed on the Lord's supper, in mosaic, by pieces extracted from the accepted fathers, and from canonists accepted only in the communion of the Roman Church, and in this point of view it is a cabinet of ecclesiastical curiosities: and of these I have given two or three specimens. I am released from examining his seven heads of doctrine on consecration, as there is hardly a point that has not come out in this book in the extracts from one or more of its chief promoters. For instance a protest has already been made against making "the word of God" in 1 Timothy iv. 5 apply to Christ The Word, and against applying to the Lord's supper what was apparently written only regarding food in general—"Every created thing of God's is good, and nothing to be cast away, being partaken of with thanksgiving: for it is consecrated (to our use) by the word of God and prayer." Its meaning is determined by the preceding clause. "Commanding to abstain from meats" does not mean abstaining from the Lord's supper. All the terms, used in certain places of the Lord's supper, how can any one interpret of it here?

On the Rubric upon Kneeling, p. 829. "'Or unto any *corporal* presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood.' In the original of 1552 we find 'or unto any *real or essential* presence there being

'of Christ's natural flesh and blood.' There is no difference of meaning; for the 'real and essential presence' was in the scholastic language of the Reformers *equivalent* to the 'corporal presence' [various proofs.] Richard Smythe, *Assertion of the Sacrament*. If Frith do take, that Christ, speaking the said words, did mean that Christ's *natural and very* body was not there *really and indeed* to be eaten in the sacrament, &c.

P. 831. "The Real Presence had indeed long been used by our divines to denote the presence of our Lord in the eucharist which our church recognises throughout the Liturgy.

P. 857. "Our Lord's own words *are not by themselves decisive*. 'This is My body' *might*, without any violation of Scriptural analogy, be held to mean no more than 'This is a figure of My body.' The true meaning of the declaration is however sufficiently apparent from the teaching of St Paul. We read (1 Cor.) Whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. The plain inference is that the body and blood of Christ *are present* even to those who eat and drink in unbelief and sin. [Answer. The true English is, "chargeable with the body and blood." Why not fill up the ellipse: shall be chargeable with doing despite to Christ's body and blood represented *in its absence* by the bread and wine?]

P. 858. "We may not be able to apprehend or to appropriate His sacred body: but *there it is*, nevertheless before us, &c. [after v. 29] That body therefore is most truly present, offering itself to the spiritual perception of all those who have eyes to see and a heart to understand. [Ans. Is not this inconsistent? What have "eyes to see" to do with "a spiritual apprehension"? But in fact *real spiritual* (body) are also inconsistent terms, unless by "spiritual" is meant as in 1 Cor. xv. the resurrection body; *i.e.* "fit for a redeemed spirit in Heaven," but human still, and therefore *not* omnipresent or multipresent.]

P. 522. After quoting Liturgies in most of which the change of the elements is spoken of as the result of the descent of the Spirit on them, Mr Scudamore writes, "It will not therefore be supposed that the work of the Holy Ghost in the sanctification of the elements was denied or doubted in those churches that did not in direct terms pray for His coming... We may be disposed to regret that the use of a prayer expressly asking *for the action of the Holy Ghost on the elements* was not universal.

P. 523. "The invocation of our own Liturgy is not an explicit prayer for the sanctification of the elements; but is rather (like the Roman) a prayer that they *may become* to us what they *can* become only through *such* sanctification.

P. 520. "The American resembles the Scotch, *but omits* the words 'that they may be to us the body and blood of Thy most 'dearly beloved Son.'

P. 525. "The sign of the cross in the prayer of consecration... The cross (at 'bless' and 'sanctify') was omitted in 1552 ... and it has not been restored.

P. 526. "*We may regret* that a rite so solemn and so significant has no longer a place in our Canon ... Before the consecration there is an adequate reason for the use of the sign. It is a very suitable mode of marking and as it were identifying the gifts offered for the especial service of the altar: and a similar reason may be assigned for its use when a blessing is invoked on them, or when *they are declared to be* the body and blood."

P. 546, &c. The full particulars of the Roman elevation of the host, and of the bell to tell the people of it: but Mr S. does not commit himself to a recommendation of these practices.

P. 558, 9. Fairly criticises S. Luke's This cup, &c., which is shed, &c.

P. 574. "The fraction (breaking) for distribution. In our liturgy the fraction for distribution takes place at the Communion; that is to say, *a piece is broken off for each communicant as it is required*... In England... the ancient custom was in a manner retained till the Reformation. 'Of the three portions,' observes Mr Maskell, 'into which the English church used to direct that 'the bread should be broken, one was to be dropped into the 'chalice, the other taken, and the third and largest either taken 'by the priest also or distributed to the communicants and 'reserved for the sick.'

P. 578. The Sarum Manual of 1554. "'If a Bishop shall 'celebrate, let the Deacon facing the people with the Bishop's 'staff in his right hand, the curvature of the staff being toward 'himself, say, "Bow yourselves for the benediction." Let the 'Choir respond, "Thanks be to God." After that, the eucharist 'being replaced on the paten, let the Bishop give (faciat) the 'benediction over the people, &c.'

P. 581. "The reader will see at once that the object and spirit of these benedictions are identical with our prayer of humble access (We do not presume, &c.) while the attitude of the worshippers reminds us of the name we love to give it."

(R.) THE REV. CANON RYLE on St John (the latest Com.)  
London.

vi. v. 63. "*It is the Spirit that quickeneth, &c.* (1) The Divine nature of Christ in contradistinction to His human nature

called His 'flesh.' (2) The Holy Spirit. It is the Holy Spirit Who alone can convey spiritual life to the soul of man. When therefore I spoke of 'eating My flesh' I did not mean the bodily act of eating any literal flesh, &c. (3) The spiritual doctrine as opposed to the letter or literal sense of Scriptural language... I think the (2) and (3) more satisfactory than (1), and I incline to prefer (2) to (3). Rollock holds that to eat the human nature of Christ alone, *i.e.* His flesh, could do us no good... the spiritual eating of faith and not any carnal eating of the Lord's supper. Hutcheson agrees with this view\*."

(S.) A NORWICH TRACT. Jarrold, Norwich, 1873.

P. 3. "— was he really believed, nor was he ashamed to acknowledge it, a priest of the church; and, as such, he thought he had been taken from men and ordained for men in things pertaining to God to offer gifts and sacrifices for sins. He therefore considered himself the representative of his people before God to make daily prayer for them, and the representative of God to the people to dispense God's absolutions and blessings to them, as the regular if not the sole channel of communication. He had of course *his altar* and *his sacrifice* of the body and the blood, *which he offered* to God, considering that this was *an extension* or continuation of the sacrifice of Christ on the cross—that he, as a priest on earth, was doing what Christ is supposed [by such persons] to be doing in Heaven—offering sacrifice. This was the central doctrine or point of his system. Only assume this, and you must grant all the rest... It is a great mistake to suppose our Great High-Priest is offering the atoning sacrifice for sin now in Heaven. The Jewish high-priest, who was a prophetic type of Christ, offered the atonement at the door and at the brazen altar which were outside the [second] veil. He entered within the veil with the blood, *which had atoned* [for the sins of the 'people'] to sprinkle the mercy seat, &c., &c. Again the idea of 'continuing' the sacrifice' is a mistake and even more, for practically it denies the words of Jesus on the cross, where He made a full perfect atonement oblation and satisfaction for sins *for ever* and cried *It is finished*. What was finished, if every possible thing relating to the propitiation of a holy God, and the atonement of most guilty man, was not finished and thoroughly completed once for all?... He did not know the difference between natural conscience, though under the influence of sacramental teaching and the Holy

\* Note. I can conceive a person preferring (1), on the ground that it gives more of correspondence in the opposite terms, *Christ's Divine Spirit* on the one hand, which can and does give life—*τὸ Πνεῦμά ἐστι τὸ ζωοποιόν*—and *Christ's flesh or body* on the other, which cannot do it, though Cyril of Alexandria said it could.

Spirit, and therefore went on contending that he had peace very often in the means of grace and especially at the holy communion. [But said his brother minister to him, Does your peace last? Yes, said he, for a time, but it is gone before the next communion comes.] His experienced brother then turned him to the fourth of St John's Gospel and shewed him 'If you drink of this water 'which you draw for yourself *you will thirst again* ... But if you 'knew the gift of God, and Who it is that is speaking to you, you 'would ask Him and He would give you living water, which would 'be in you a well of water springing up unto everlasting life.' 'Have you got that religion?' 'Yes,' was the reply. 'How did 'you obtain it?' 'By simply doing as the word directs. The 'woman asked immediately, Sir, give me this water ... And she 'left her water-pot and went into the city and said, Is not this 'the Christ?'"

The clergyman whose experience is given in the tract followed the advice, and found it true—as the tract was I believe written to shew—in order that others inwardly pained with a similar want, may follow the advice, and, like him, find true and lasting pardon and habitual assurance of true and everlasting peace by going straight to Christ for it.

(T.) *The theory of Consecration of the most holy Eucharist,*  
by H. H. Edin. 1873.

P. 15. "There must be a reason for what we would affirm, viz. the uniform succession [of parts in a communion service]. If we will not try to get the meaning out of them as they stand, there is a nemesis—we shall never get to understand them at all. Dr Neale wishes the invocation put after the oblation. And why? And Mr Freeman hastily concludes from the supposed difference of arrangement in the Syriac Liturgy that '*the order and existence* 'of such prayers is a matter of indifference, *having no effect on the* 'validity of consecration.' Perhaps not, if the structure of the office did not demand them. *But it does:* and *to leave them out* or alter their arrangement *would be fatal* to the integrity and meaning of the Liturgy, as a vehicle for human devotion, and so would be *displeasing to God*. For what is the idea on which they are constructed? Plainly *upon what the Jewish Christians saw before them in the temple*. All the parts of the temple service ... are here drawn out in words. First There is the mactation of the victim, and second, after the offerer had slain the victim the priest took the blood and made *the oblation*. The oblation implies this, that the sacrifice of the New Testament is now pleaded for us



before the throne and altar on high. Third The invocation of the Holy Ghost follows because the next step was to place the victim on the altar and burn it. This is the type of that conversion, whereby the fire of the Holy Ghost does not consume but transelement earthly things into Heavenly ... To alter the order or to omit any portion of a liturgy so constructed is to spoil it.

P. 18. "Hoc est corpus Meum. What is the hoc? Is it bread or not? No Roman theologian can determine, though many have tried. Dogmatically *it is not*. In the order of time *it is*. As the subject of the sentence, it is something distinct from the predicate. According to the Roman belief the consecration does not take place till the last word [Meum] is uttered. The subject and predicate then coalesce and form one new substance. Thus when you point out 'This,' as being something, you are saying what is untrue: because it is not *that something* at the time you say so. There is no getting over this difficulty; and it becomes all the more apparent in the consecration of the chalice, because so many words are interposed between the subject and the end of the sentence ... No reason why you should not admit a dozen prayers as well as a dozen words ... This insurmountable difficulty it is which caused the rubrical order that the celebrant should say all the words of consecration in one breath, as though *that* tied subject and predicate together without the intermission of time."

#### (U.) THE CAPEL-LIDDON CONTROVERSY IN THE "TIMES," 1874.

The substance of this controversy, after clearing away all mists, is (1) the question whether the doctrine of the real presence of Christ's body in the Lord's supper is definitely distinguishable from transubstantiation; and (2) whether the Church of England is bound to the former and not to the latter. But both questions were discussed upon this occasion on the insufficient ground of the opinions that have been held by individual members of the English church: and this mode of settling the question has only to be applied to the general interpretation of the Bible, and every Protestant will allow its insufficiency. The principle of Protestantism is that the consciences of men in any age are not bound by the general scope of the opinions held by those that were reputedly orthodox in any age or in any number of ages, since Divine inspiration ceased. Then by exactly similar reasoning Christian men may belong to the Church of England if they do not hold the general scope of the reputedly orthodox fathers of

the Church of England during any one age or any number of ages. In relation to Christianity the New Testament words are the only standard, and they lie open to all possible argument *ab infra* and *ab extra* as to their interpretation, but not to any summary irreversible decisions of subsequent authorities. And so in relation to the Church of England the appeal in law as to her doctrines, and to her own sacraments only, and the interpretation of her words, lies open to every argument from grammar, logic, rhetoric and history: but no chosen body of divines are to be received as dictating the interpretation of the words of that church, either to her courts of law or to individuals. The question then whether the Church of England holds the real presence cannot be decided in the way here attempted. As to the bearings of consubstantiation, transubstantiation and the more general doctrine of a real presence, something will be found at the close of the extracts from this latest controversy: but it is intended to say somewhat more in a Third Part of this work: the Patristic authorities constituting the Second Part: and the promised volume on the teaching of the Scripture on this subject being the First Portion.

*The Hour.* London Newspaper, No. L. February 4, 1875.

"The collected letters of M. Capel and Canon Liddon.

Canon Liddon. "Believing as we do that 'the body and blood 'of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful 'in the Lord's supper,' we necessarily believe in the real presence of Christ in that sacrament, since unless He is really present He cannot be taken and received at all. [I collected some years ago some of the same high Ritualist, or as they were once called Tractarian productions, and I found that they started precisely as Canon Liddon does from this one answer in the Catechism, and inferred the real presence of Christ's body from it in just the same way.] But we reject the Roman explanation of His presence. Transubstantiation cannot be proved by Holy Writ; and, as annihilating the outward part, 'it overthroweth the nature of a 'sacrament.' [On this point Maldonat should be consulted. It is also perhaps almost equally difficult not to overthrow the nature of a sacrament on any theory of the Real Presence of Christ's body: for as many reasonably urge, a sacrament is a sign of a sacred thing which is absent. And if it be argued, as Maldonat does, that a sign is useful because Christ's body in its earthly mode is invisible, he lies open to another question, Is a body existent in so strange a mode that it is not visible, tangible, divisible, &c.? Is it a human body? But Christ is never said in

Scripture to have had His body changed since He arose. This is argued in a lecture at Norwich printed at the end of this volume.]

Monsignor Capel. "The catechetical notes' of the late revered Dr Neale of St Margaret's, East Grinstead, contain the following declarations concerning the real presence ... 'All matter 'is divided into the accidents and the substance. Accidents of 'matter are those things which make a thing appear what it is. 'Substance is that which makes a thing to be what it is. The 'accidents remain; the substance is changed.' Canon Liddon cannot but admit this is a clear exposition of transubstantiation taught by an eminent high-church divine.

Canon Liddon. "It may be that the direction of Dr Neale's studies would have made him less alive than some of us to the enormous difficulties of the philosophical theory which is assumed to be true—by the distinction which he makes between substance and accidents. Anyhow I cannot in this matter defend him, &c. [Some remarks on the reasonableness of using these terms independently of all theories about matter and phenomena are added at the close of these extracts.]

M. Capel. "It is still more unsatisfactory to find Canon Liddon excusing the line, 'Bread into His flesh is turned,' on the plea that it is in all probability due to inadvertence ... Had the Canon examined a few of the advanced books of devotion, he would have found that it is the usual way to express, as in Mr Carter's book, the doctrine of transubstantiation. [Three instances.] ... In 'the Night-hours of the church' the doctrine is stated in the plainest way, p. 173 ... Bread and wine are substantially changed into the body and blood of Christ ... The accident subsists without a subject, that faith may have her place, while a visible thing is invisibly received hidden under an alien form; and the senses are set free from deception, in that they decide on accidents that are familiar to them. Indeed these are the very words of St Thomas Aquinas. When I see our prayers transferred wholesale to Ritualist books of devotion—when others like Mr Orby Shipley publish, 'The Ritual of the Altar,' according to the 'use of the Church of England,' and I find therein the whole of our mass, &c. &c. [See Lecture at Norwich at the end of this volume.]

Canon Liddon. "He may depend upon it that I will do my best to promote the excision of the fungi to which he has called attention, &c.

M. Capel. "In 1865 a book was published under the title of 'The Priest to the Altar.' I am informed by a brother of the brotherhood of the Holy Trinity, to which the Canon is said to have belonged, &c., that the book was edited by Dr Liddon and

another high-church clergyman. Therein just before the usual words of consecration is inserted the prayer, 'Send down Thy Holy Spirit upon this sacrifice, that He may make this bread the 'body of Thy Christ,' &c., &c., respecting the worship of the Virgin Mary.

Dr Liddon. "'The Priest to the Altar' was compiled by a clergyman of somewhat vehement anti-Roman tendencies, in whose learning and critical judgment I have entire confidence; and my own relation to it is limited to this—I revised some of the proof-sheets before publication, and I defrayed a part of the expenses, &c. But I must maintain that the book is an honest Church of England work, and that it does not teach transubstantiation, &c., &c.

[The real question of course is, are we or are we not in all such enterprises keeping fairly within the limits marked out by our doctrinal standards? &c.]

"When I wrote to you the other day I had no recollection whatever of the line which M. Capel quotes from this book, 'Bread into His flesh is turned'... I entirely admit that the phrase is patristic, and therefore Anglican. [Then Anglican does not mean belonging to the Church of England: for certainly the Church of England does not adopt all that the fathers said, though Jewel rashly committed *himself* to the fathers of the first six centuries.]... But M. Capel always quotes the prayer 'Send down,' &c., as above, as if it implied transubstantiation—as if the verb 'to make' could mean nothing else or less than to change the metaphysical substance of one thing into the metaphysical substance of another thing; whereas the prayer might even be used in a subjective sense altogether (Bishop Wilson quoted). [This may be very stoutly disputed both in the Canon and the Bishop: but the extracts given from Bp. W. give small ground for believing that he used this kind of petition in a subjective sense], (and Canon Liddon gives the following as a fair utterance of Church of England piety). The bread has ceased to be bread. Christ's body only is really here. The senses which tell me that what I see, touch, taste is still substantial bread cannot be trusted. [Two remarks are required. (1) This is not a subjective but an objective meditation: and (2) Canon Liddon uses the term of an exploded philosophy "substance" to the use of which he but now demurred]. [Then follow citations from Bishop Thirlwall, from whom I have already made long extracts. So I only cite a part of the citation in a note.] The development, which has been proceeding before our eyes during the last ten years has culminated in an approximation to Romish doctrine and ritual so close as to render the remaining interval hardly perceptible to common observers... They make no secret of their desire and intention, so far as lies in their power to bring about a complete transforma-

tion of the Church of England into the likeness of the Church of Rome in every particular short of immediate submission to the Pope."

#### (V.) SUMMARY OBSERVATIONS.

The writings of the Christian fathers and of other leading followers in subsequent ages to the apostolical, and even the extracts here made from them, will fully establish these three things; (1) That consubstantiation was held, virtually, by those who asserted that the substance of the bread remained after consecration, and (2) That transubstantiation was held, virtually, by those that affirmed that *only* the body of the Lord was there, under the sensible qualities of bread, and (3) that very slowly indeed was there any approximation to the third alternative; *viz.* that our Lord's real natural body might be believed to be there in some other than either of the two ways above mentioned; or that we may content ourselves with believing that His real natural body is present without enquiring in what way the presence exists; and in utter disregard of all philosophic and other arguments that seem to deny the possibility, without such an utter overthrow of some of the first natural laws as we may think we are not justified in attributing to God, in the absence of any express and indisputable declaration from Him to that effect. This last definition may be termed the doctrine of the real presence, regarded as independent of the doctrines (1) and (2).

Our chief business then in obtaining clear ideas of writings on this subject for many centuries is to compare the lines of thought (1) and (2). The vague word 'virtually,' which has been used for the sake of brevity, has now to be explained. In (1) it means that those who affirmed that the substance of the bread remains after consecration agreed with what Luther in one part of his life held, *viz.* that an entire Christ is there and the entire bread also: for all persons believed both that the sensible qualities of bread were there and that the entire body of the Lord was there; and all held that the Divinity and the human soul were present with the body of Christ; and in (2) it is meant that those who denied that the substance of the bread remained believed all the rest that was held by the persons in (1). So that in fact there was but one difference in what they held and that difference was

concerning the substance, the (1) holding it to be there, the (2) denying that it was there.

Minor points of difference, such as whether it was the Person of the Son, or the Logos, that was united with the sensible qualities and substances or substance, we need not mention. It is enough to say that by class (1) it was held that the entire Christ was present with the entire bread; while class (2) held that the entire Christ was there, but that the substance of the bread was removed, or, as they would say exchanged, for the substance of Christ's body.

Canon Liddon and many others object to Mr Mason Neale's use of the word 'substance,' as not being in accordance with modern physical theories regarding objects of the perceptive faculties. But if the meaning assigned to the word 'substance' be clearly understood, and the idea corresponding be a definite one, it is sufficient for the purposes of discussion. Every one will concede the use of the term 'sensible qualities' to signify whatever it be in any object that affects our perceptive faculties. Then by 'substance' is merely meant whatever may be supposed to be left in any object, if the sensible qualities are supposed to have been taken away. Any person is quite at liberty to hold that we cannot believe in anything beyond the sequences of phenomena and their classification: but the terms 'sensible qualities' and 'substances,' as defined above, are definite, and will serve as counters in Mr Mason Neale's reasoning or in ours.

It is therefore only needful to repeat that the Tridentine doctrine of transubstantiation was virtually held by those that denied that the substance of the bread remains after consecration; and that the Lutheran doctrine of consubstantiation was virtually held by those that affirmed that after the consecration the bread remained. The refinements referred to in the extracts from Bellarmine and Thirlwall, as to the different *modes* in which the body of Christ may be or is present, in Heaven and in the Lord's supper on earth, were certainly not anticipated when the name of transubstantiation was adopted, even in 1215, *i.e.* when the council of Innocent III. put forth its short decree regarding the opinions marked (2) in this note.

## L'ENVOI.

I cannot let this work close without rendering thanks to Him, whose feeble instruments we are. The work has been in all its parts most delightful, for I have found, what I hope may in various degrees be realized by my readers, that to ponder the careful expressions of so many of the greatest of our Christian Divines, works strongly to augment our general knowledge, to enlarge the grasp of our affections, to refine and ripen the judgment, and what is most of all precious, to do all this regarding the word of God, on which all these men more or less laboured to build. Their errors are warning beacons, their truths enlighten our course and shew us the harbour. May GOD speed our way!

In the wide compass of history and doctrine, which it has been needful to traverse, the author could not but become frequently conscious of the limitations of our powers and knowledge. But the feeling is the same in all the efforts of man under any emotion, from the plaint of Virgil's rustic singer,

Quod potui, sylvestri ex arbore lecta  
Aurea mala decem misi,

to the lavish gift of the grateful anointress of our Saviour's feet whom He honoured with His measured approval, "She hath done "what she could." It is all that we can hope to attain to here.

When half the second volume was already printed, the continuance of the anxiety, that arose from not being able to find a true yoke-fellow, made it necessary for the writer to resign his parochial charge. His consolation is to serve God in any ways that remain, and to dwell still among his late loving and beloved people.

## APPENDIX I.

A LECTURE DELIVERED AT A PUBLIC MEETING IN  
THE CITY OF NORWICH, IN THE YEAR 1874.

TITLE :

*"Is there not a cause?"*

(WITH LETTERS.)

## APPENDIX II.

AN ADDRESS READ AT A LARGE CLERICAL MEETING  
AT FURNESS ABBEY, IN THE YEAR 1876.

SUBJECT :

*What notices of Evening Communion are to be found in the  
Fathers of the third and fourth centuries?*

(WITH A LETTER.)





## APPENDIX I.

### "IS THERE NOT A CAUSE?"

*A Lecture delivered at Norwich on February 23, 1874, and reported entire in the County Paper with letters that followed.*

BY THE REV. CHARLES HEBERT, D.D.,  
RECTOR OF LOWESTOFT, SUFFOLK.

EVERY Christian heart hates war with perfect hatred for its various miseries, its immoralities, and its huge waste of taxation: but it will be within the memory of the readers of Tennyson that in his maddest and most imaginative poem, "Maud," he gives himself to a panegyric upon war, as the awakener of stagnant nations, lost, in the mere pursuit of wealth, to moral grandeur and virtue. However much may be said on either side of that question, there can hardly be a doubt as to the usefulness of a good hearty struggle on some great question of religious controversy in the universal visible church, if it be conducted in a fair and equitable spirit. That such a struggle will ere long arise among us, on the dogma of the presence of Christ in the Lord's supper appears, I suppose, quite certain to every forelooking Christian. We may not be ripe for it just yet. I do not think we are. But the general compromise, in which the question is now slumbering, is not a natural state of things, and cannot last. It reminds me of Pascal's wit on *la grâce suffisante qui ne suffit pas*; and instead of looking for continued peace, and silence about differences, I think we should do well to be like the Prussians before their last great campaign, viz.—providing ourselves before all things with good maps of the territory where the struggle is to be carried on, if, peradventure, we may be instrumental in our measure in promoting the victory of Bible truth in Christendom on this matter.

Can there be a more important topic than the supper, which our blessed Lord left us, as almost His last gift to the Church, when He

N. B. *A few sentences of mere local interest are omitted, and an explanation of ô ànp added.*

was about to leave it for nearly two thousand years, weak and greatly in need of His Heavenly care, among the children of the world and the kings of the earth, to contend with thousands of foes,—foes without and false brethren within? It is not my purpose to call your attention to-night to the enemies without. That saying of St Paul is most germane to my subject—a saying full of the deepest pathos—“Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them.”

We love to deal with plain and patent facts. We blame no one for his zeal. Perhaps the greatest offenders of all are the crowds of Gallios who have no zeal, who care for none of these things. A Saul, even while he is persecuting the Church, is a more hopeful character, if (like him) he is doing it of conscience, than these comfortable and easy worldlings, who think us mere disturbers, because we stand up to defend that purity of doctrine which God Himself teaches us in the Bible. We do not at all forget that there may be some of a different class, wilful deceivers. I for one sometimes think there are sworn Jesuits, and not a few, in our own camp, as there were in Elizabeth's reign: but, till I can actually discover such, I would reason with every opponent, with all courtesy, and endeavour to give a fair and unbiassed interpretation, both to the speeches which I hear, and to the printed words which I read. I shall not encumber you with many books. We shall go little beyond two. The Rev. W. E. Scudamore's “*Notitia Eucharistica*,” and the “*Ritual of the Altar*,” by the Rev. Orby Shipley.

Mr Scudamore is of this diocese. I adduce nothing of his but this book, which is an 8vo. of about 900 pages: but I am informed that it obtains a considerable sale in America as well as in England. He took high mathematical honours in the University of Cambridge, in 1835. He was 9th Wrangler, and he resigned a Fellowship in his College (St John's) to take the Rectory of Ditchingham, near Beccles, in 1839, which he still holds. He describes this book in its title page as a Commentary, Explanatory, Doctrinal, and Historical, on the Order of administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion. It was published in 1871. I see that he has published a little work that has reached its 42nd Edition, and is now stereotyped. The title is “Steps to the Altar: Devotions for the Blessed Eucharist.” Another book of his is called “*England and Rome*,” the purport of which I assume to be to urge us to remain in England. And there are several others, some of them less marked than these, but all of the same family and character. I think then we may imagine Mr Scudamore to be a substantial and eminent representative man of his own class, and to be every way fit and worthy to be brought before you to-night.

But we must first mark out and fortify some part of our position, that we may know what we believe. The thing I try to find out first in a book on this subject is, what it teaches on the one most important point of all, the "Real Presence;"—but it is safer to give it at full: the "Real Presence of Christ's Body." If you wish to know a person's real opinion on the point, and he says "I hold the Real Presence," it is well to ask, "Do you mean the Real Presence of Christ's Body?" Why is this so important? For the following reasons. Our blessed Lord is of *two natures* united. It was so decided at the Fourth Council, held in 451, at Chalcedon, viz. That the Son of God retained His Divine Nature perfect, and took to it—took into union with it a perfect man's nature, like that of Adam as created at first. And so also when our blessed Master, Christ, rose from the tomb of Joseph, He took to Him again the same body, and was again perfect man, (body and soul) united to His perfect Godhead. What proof is there that it was the same body? It is well said that "Thomas's doubts are our certainties:" for his Lord, Who had first shewed to all the Apostles present His hands and His side, did, on the second Sabbath-eve, offer to let Thomas put his finger into the prints of the nails in His hands, and thrust his hand into the wound of the spear in His side. This was to shew that it *was* a true human body, because it was the same. As it was a true human body before, so it was a true human body after. He also gave other signs on the First Evening. "While they yet believed not for joy, He said, 'Children, have ye any meat?'" meaning by this that His body wanted food, as it did before; and they gave Him meat, as He asked it; and He took it and did eat before them, viz.—of a piece of broiled fish and an honey-comb. We know not at all how that body was supplied with food afterwards for the forty days; and there we leave it. But there is not a word said in the Scripture of any change in Christ's body after He rose from the dead; indeed I know nothing that bears on the subject at all, except the symbolic figure in the Revelation. "I looked," says St John, "and lo! a lamb, as it had been slain," i.e. with the wounds of its death still on it, though alive; and you will observe the exact correspondence between that symbolic figure of Jesus seen by John in the sky, and Jesus Himself as He appeared to the disciples on the evening of the resurrection, and again when Thomas was with them. Certain papal divines, I know, and some others, say, "O but it could not 'have been a real body, because He went through the closed doors.'" But who is the authority for that? Who tells us He went through closed doors? It does not say that they were not opened to Him. His mere word or will could have opened and closed them. Leave that matter. He could choose His own way. It seems, however, that

some kind of miracle was wrought by Him. At any rate, Why should we surrender belief in His body being a real one, and the same as it was before, giving up all that we learned from His shewing the holes in His hands and feet and side, and from His eating food before the disciples? Dr Wiseman, however, for one, denies that it was a real body; but then he maintains that it was shewn to be a spiritual body and not a real one; (1) Because it went through these closed doors; and (2) Because it went through the stone at the sepulchre also. Any Protestant child would tell him that the Gospel says that "an angel" *was sent* to roll away the stone for Him. But it is more strange that Dr Pusey follows Dr Wiseman in the same slip. I have read both in the works of the two learned Doctors.

We do well, then, to hold fast the evidence which Scripture gives us, that our Lord's body rose from the dead in very manhood unchanged: the first token I find of a time at which He is to appear with a changed body, is at the Judgment Day, 1 Corinthians, xv., "The 'second man is the Lord from Heaven.'" He will then appear, as I read it, in His glorified form—with a glorified body—to judge the world. Then, if we follow Scripture in its silence as well as when it speaks, we have no authority for asserting that our Lord's body has yet been changed at all.

I will continue, then, on this hypothesis. We can take up the other view presently. If, then (as the silence of Scripture as to any change seems to imply), the body of Jesus in Heaven is still the same human body, as when He walked on earth, and was crucified on the cross (assertions which, by the way, are in constant use with almost all the Fathers), I come to this conclusion, that His present body, in which He ascended to Heaven, is a body exactly after the pattern of our bodies—no more and no less, except in this, that (like Adam's body when it first came from God's hands) Christ's body was untainted and undamaged, by never having known a single sin. He rose as He came, as a lamb without blemish, holy, harmless, separate from sinners; yet, in other respects, His body was like our bodies, for He was made in all things like unto His brethren. This body, therefore, of our Lord Jesus, on this hypothesis, is, at the present time, still a finite or limited body, just like ours. It has not the faculty of omnipresence, but can only be in one place at a time, just as our bodies; so that if it is here, it is not in Heaven too; and, reversely, if it is in Heaven it cannot be here also. That it went to Heaven at His ascension we know, for He prophesied of this in John vi., "What and if ye shall see 'the Son of Man ascend up where He was before?'" And there He sits or remains, as it is said in the 2nd Psalm, "Sit Thou at My right

“hand, till I have made Thine enemies Thy footstool.” And He remains there till He returns to regenerate, *i.e.* to restore this fallen world, as St Peter says, “Whom the Heaven must receive until the “time of the restitution of all things.” I have dwelt on this thus particularly, step by step, because I wish you to be able to call to mind on what solid grounds our Church stands in making the assertion that Christ (*i.e.* Christ’s manhood) is not on earth now. “The natural body “of Christ is in Heaven and not here; it being contrary to the truth “of Christ’s natural body to be at one time in more places than one.” You know this part of the Rubric at the end of the Communion Service. Some have named this the black Rubric. But nearly the same words were in one of our Articles till they were moved to this very conspicuous place. And now you see the reason why I ventured to suggest that, if any one says to you, “I believe in the real presence “of Christ in the sacrament of the Lord’s supper,” you should ask again, “Do you mean that you believe in the presence of Christ’s *body* “in that holy supper?” If he replies, “Yes I do,” you have only to answer, “Then I am sorry to say that you believe *exactly opposite* to “the Church of England; for *you* say, ‘Christ’s natural body is on “‘earth,’ and the Church of England says, ‘It is in Heaven, *not here.*’” Two things cannot “be more opposite.” We have thus settled the question that (on the first hypothesis, of Christ’s body being now what it was when it was crucified and afterwards raised from the dead) it *cannot be on earth*; because the Bible tells us that it is in Heaven, and will remain there till He come again.

Let us now take up the second hypothesis, for some will perhaps say—“Your argument is good, if Christ’s body is still exactly the “same as when He was crucified and raised; but what becomes of your “conclusions if He is already glorified,—if He has already put on the “glorified body, described in chapter xv. of the 1st of Corinthians?” My answer is plain: it turns on this, that a glorified human body is not God; it is not Divine. A man has in no case any of the special attributes of the Godhead. But omnipresence is one special attribute of God. “Do not I fill heaven and earth? saith the Lord.” This then belongs to God only. Neither angels nor men have the faculty of omnipresence, or even of multipresence, *i.e.* none but God is present in more places than one at one time; no one puts this better than Peter Martyr. But to go on:—To assert the contrary, would be to say that an angel or a glorified man is not a limited creature—not a finite being—which is not true; for God only is infinite. It follows then that even if Christ’s body *be* already glorified, it makes no difference at all to all my conclusions about His body, in this one point that it

cannot be in two places at once : that, as it is said to be in Heaven at God's right hand, it cannot at the same time be here at the Lord's supper ; therefore we may conclude that on either hypothesis, Christ's body is not on earth.

If any of the ancient fathers or ancient churches, or if any of the ancient or modern divines say, that Christ's natural body, or (to speak fully) Christ's natural body and blood *are present* in the Lord's supper, they are in error—they are wrong on this most important point. I believe it to be one of the very most important points of all our belief ; and it is a point on which (with the exception, at most, of one short answer in the catechism) our church is *perfectly clear*. Can anything for instance be clearer than the whole latter part of the Rubric which I have quoted ? “ It is here declared,” so runs the Rubric, “ that “thereby” (*i.e.* by our kneeling down at the rails,) “ no adoration “is intended, or ought to be done, *either* unto the sacramental “bread or wine there bodily received” (*i.e.* through our mouths into our bodies) “ or unto any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh “and blood: for the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their “very” (*i.e.* true) “natural substances,” (*i.e.* there is no *trans*-substantiation) and therefore may not be adored ; for that were idolatry, “to be abhorred of all faithful Christians ; and the natural body and “blood of our Saviour Christ *are in Heaven*, and NOT HERE ; it being “against the truth of Christ's natural body, to be at one time in more “places than one.”

I hope I do not appear to have been needlessly precise, or to have spent too long a time on this point, for I have had two reasons for doing this part of my work with such accuracy. First, that the point is of such great importance ; and second, because it is so good a test. I like a good test. A good test is one that is very simple in its nature, and that comes out very clear in its application, and that never fails. And I think you fully see that this test never can fail.

I wish as far as we can do it, to put an end to the vague and misty mode of discussing the presence of Christ in this Sacred Rite. I have known so much of fencing, and, what one may even term, dodging, and logical hair splitting, and declarations that we cannot expect to understand every thing in these mysteries, and that it is a kind of rationalism to ask a man what he really does mean, and that ignorance is the mother of devotion (which I do not admit), and a thousand other reasons of the same class, all which, I confess, do not, in my judgment, together amount to *half a scruple*. But this help have we, that a human body is an intelligible thing, at least *in this one respect* (whether as at present or glorified), *that it does not possess*

*omnipresence or multipresence.* If, therefore, I ask a man, "Is Christ's body—are Christ's natural body and blood present in the Lord's supper?" I think I can require and insist on a plain and definite answer, Yes or No. There is a note in Hallam's Constitutional History of England, which affirms that it is a question of yes or no; therefore, under that high lay authority I shelter myself, like Teucer behind the great shield of Ajax: for I quite concur with Mr Hallam that it is a question of "yes or no."

Either then the natural body of my Lord Jesus is present in that Sacrament, or it is not present there. It must be one or other. And I am now a great way on with any one, when I have brought him to tell me just this: Which of the two he believes and holds. For if Christ's natural body is there, the Church of England is wrong. But if he says, "the natural body is not there," this is what the Church of England "declares," saying, "It is declared." And—Never omit, I say, that one word of our Church's explanation—"natural," "the real presence of Christ's *natural* body."

I am not unaware, that I may for the last quarter of an hour have taxed your kind attention: but we shall come to lighter work presently. I have but endeavoured to shew by a decisive test, how you may discern the true holders of Church of England-and-Bible-doctrines on this subject. What if I turn for a moment and say, that, though it be right and necessary in these dangerous days to apply this searching test to *others*, to be assured of *their* orthodoxy,—Is it not well also that everyone should apply it to themselves, to be sure of their own? Ought we not each one to discern whether we are ourselves well established in the cardinal truth, that there is no presence of Christ's body now on earth at all; either at the Lord's table, or even in the heart of a living believer. For both ideas are excluded if Christ's body is human,—Christ's body "is in Heaven, *and not here.*"

And may we not now pass from living men, to those precious and dear companions—books? friends that need never deceive us, for they never change their wording while we carry on our enquiry. *Litera scripta manet.* And it pleases me that in part, Mr Scudamore's book is quite consistent in this, that it draws no confusing distinction between "Christ's real presence," and "the real presence of Christ's body and blood;" and I so far honour both him, and every one who holds these terms to be convertible and equivalent to each other. In pages 852 to 860, he dwells on this subject; for those pages contain this comment on the very rubric which we have thought so *decisive*. I am sorry to say that my praise of him for consistency must soon



cease; but you shall judge then. In sections from 852—856, he begins well by adducing a catena of passages to shew that "Christ's true body cannot be in Heaven and earth at the same time," and he ends by saying, "Can it be doubted that these writers would have accused 'the Church of Rome of *confounding the properties of Christ's Divine and human nature*, when *she* teaches and affirms that in His human nature, in the true substance of His soul and body," (he means Christ's *human* soul and body), "He can be and is present at many altars at the same instant of time;" i.e. Mr Scudamore utterly denies this, and adduces these writers as denying it too. Nothing, I say, in our view can be more orthodox and more scriptural than Mr Scudamore in this. But does Mr Scudamore continue in this true Protestant strain regarding the holy supper in the following chapters? Alas! how soon the glory of man declines. Would you expect the title of the next to be, "The *real and spiritual presence* of Christ's body?" And he then proceeds to undo all that he had so plainly said. He now refines logic; he turns upon terms; shall I say, he splits hairs? he just now denied the presence of Christ's "*true body*" in the sacrament, and now, he writes from p. 857 to p. 858 to prove the presence of Christ's "*real and spiritual body*."

I stop, then, to ask,—Have I been at all too cautious, too punctilious, in what has gone before? Is there not a cause? O, what a blessed thing it is that we may reason closely on the Bible! O, what a protection to the faith is, what some one calls "inexorable logic!" What? Has Christ two bodies? One, His true body: another, His real and spiritual body? If they mean Christ's glorified body—assuming that it is already glorified, though Scripture does not tell us so—I answer: If it is now changed into a glorious body, the old body that was born and crucified and raised, does not exist too. It is changed into the other. So there are not *two* Christs: not two bodies: (1) His true body, (2) His real and spiritual body. Yet Mr Scudamore asserts that there *are* two: for he speaks very confidently of one—His true body (which is certainly in Heaven, and not here); and the other—His real and spiritual, which is here present in the holy supper. But has the Bible given any hint of Jesus having two bodies? O, the strange ways of escape to which persons have recourse! But this is but one of the many equally unjustifiable confusions of ideas that are to be read in the hundreds of books and treatises on the Lord's supper. But be assured that most of the Fathers—for instance, the most Aristotelian of all, John Damascenus—deny with emphasis there being two bodies. He declares it to be a most unchristian heresy. But you may yourselves judge of it. What does that uncommon thing,

common sense, decide? You are acquainted with the Holy Scriptures? Say they that Jesus has two bodies at the same time? John of Damascus, in his letter to Zacharias Bishop of the Doari, says, Δύο σώματα Χριστοῦ λέγειν οὐ δυνάμεθα· ἀλλ' ἐν ἑστί τὸ σῶμα Αὐτοῦ...Μεχρὶ τοῦ βρωθῆναι ὑφ' ἡμῶν φθαρτὸν αὐτὸ λέγομεν. Vol. II., Migne's Edition. In English, "We cannot say two bodies of Christ, but on the contrary, His body is "one. We call it a mortal body until it has been eaten." I can answer for the meanings of the context: for I don't like taking bits at second hand. We have to go to the authors themselves.

I will now take you to some lighter work from Mr Scudamore's large and laborious volume. But let me first ask: Are you Ritualists? But why are you not Ritualists? What do you take to be the best of all the reasons you can assign for not being Ritualists? I believe the best of all reasons is—that Roman Ritualism covers Roman doctrine. Do you care so much about bowings and turnings, and colours and lights, and crosses and surplices, and copes, in themselves? You could give some liberty in all externals, were it not that under the guise of Roman ceremonies, Roman revolutionists are introducing, and making familiar to the eye, and suggesting to the mind of the people, those very Roman doctrines which honest, glorious Hugh Latimer, and the learned Ridley, and the reviled, but most meritorious and hard-working Archbishop Cranmer, died to deliver us from. This is my point—that Roman Ritualism covertly introduces Roman doctrine. You shall settle this regarding three instances that I will bring from Mr Scudamore. (1) The Eucharistic Pall, or Corporal: (2) The Eucharistic Fan: and (3) The Asterisk, or the Eucharistic Cradle.

Chap. XI. is concerning the point in the service in which, after the sermon, the minister returns to the Lord's table to begin reading the sentences of the Offertory. Page 303, "according to the earliest *Ordo Romanus*. Amalarius, who commented on it A.D. 827, says "The corporal was now put upon the Altar (page 304): the custom "was to spread it, after the Offertory Anthem had been sung." Thus Rabanus Maurus at Mayence, A.D. 819, "Oblations are now offered "by the people, and the offertory is sung by the Clergy, and the "Pall of the Corporal is put on the Altar."

But you will stop me one moment. What are these terms? "A Pall" is properly a cloak. The old Latins used to have a proverb—"a man's tunic is closer to him than his pall." We should say—"a man's shirt is nearer his skin than his coat." We now generally use pall for a *cloak of state*, like the palls that Archbishops used to have to get from Rome from the Pope—and to pay for them too. But here it is a *covering of state* for the communion table, which was

to be cast over it, just after the offertory. But why is it called the "corporal," or "the pall of the corporal"? A corporal means a covering for the *body*. Do you think there may be some particular meaning in this? It sounds very like a covering for the *Saviour's body*. Then, I say, this Roman ritualism sounds like the Roman teaching, that the body of Christ is there on the table.

Let us go on. "We trace the custom in France, through "Hildebert "of Le Mans, 1097, down to Durandus, Bishop of Mende, in 1286. In "the meantime" (saith the latter) "while the priest is washing his "hands (after the offertory has been sung, but before making the oblation)" (i.e. before he puts the alms on the holy table) "the Deacon "arranges the corporal pall upon the altar, etc." But is this merely antiquarianism? Or is it brought forward by Mr Scudamore for us to admire and adopt? In this particular case, we are not left to conjectures, which some might think fair, and others hesitate to receive; for in the same page Mr Scudamore says, "It appears to me "that there would be a great advantage in this rule, *if it could be introduced now among ourselves*.....that the altar should be covered, &c.; "it would mark in a very striking manner the beginning of the more "sacred part of the holy office." So he wishes the corporal pall to be adopted in our churches. Page 34 gives another sense to the words "corporals," York—"The priest shall then wash his hands, and place "the host upon *corporal cloths*;" and page 357, "At the earliest period "there was but one cloth employed, which after a time we find called "*the corporal*." In all the three usages, we see Roman customs teaching Roman doctrine.

I proceed to No. 2, The Eucharistic Fan, § VIII. p. 359. "In the "Greek Liturgy, this end" (the keeping away of dust and insects) "is attained by the constant waving of a Fan, or by the veil. After the "offertory, the Deacon takes the Asterisk" (of which presently), "and "makes the sign of the cross with it over the holy Disk" (*Discus* is a plate or *dish*), "and having wiped it (the Disk) on the corporal, and "kissed it, places it with the air," i.e. (the thinner, we should say the muslin cloth that is to cover it), "and then he goes over to the right, and "fans reverently over the Holy things, with the fan," &c. "The custom "is very ancient, for we find it in the Apostolic Constitutions. Let "two deacons on each side of the Altar hold a fan, made of thin "membranes, or of peacocks' feathers, or of fine linen, and gently drive "away the winged insects. 'The customs of Clugny' says, to drive "them away from the *Sacrifice*, and *Altar*, and from the *Priest* "himself."

Now, (3) The Asterisk. In a note to page 359, "The Asterisk or

"Star is formed of two thin bars of silver, at right angles, with the ends bent (down), a kind of cradle, placed over the holy bread, to prevent the particles of it being disordered by the veil."

Regarding these three usages, one naturally asks: Does not all this extreme care seem to teach, that, there is on the holy table something more than consecrated bread and wine, to be so honoured? But there is a little more about this last ordinance of Clugny, and it interprets the rest: "When it (the Asterisk) is first put over the disk, in the office of "the Prothesis" at the Credence table, "the Priest says, 'and *the star* "came and stood over where the *young child* was laid.'" This sounds at least very like a teaching of the real bodily presence. It gives the reason too, why the silver grating takes the name of "the Star or "Asterisk." I would ask now: Is it not possible to multiply Roman ceremonies of this sort till Bible truth disappears under Roman doctrine, and till real spiritual feeling is lost in the complicity of the performances? A survey, like Mr Scudamore's, of all that was ever done in various early and mediæval and later churches at the celebration of the mass, becomes a kind of museum of extinct and living ritualism. And much of this some would bring into use again, in England and Scotland and America, and in the churches of the colonies, if they could; I cannot say that I wish to see and hear of their having great success. But I wish I thought there was no danger that some more of these vain superstitions and childish symbolisms may take root. I fancy that the folly of man as he is, fallen and unconverted, is far greater than philosophers admit, or most people imagine! And I really think that the one protection to each one of us, against these follies and sins, is to love Jesus Christ, and to hold living communion with Him day by day. If I see my Saviour present in the Spirit to my living faith, I want not His body crucified again for me in the mass, nor all these fancies of man, to teach me that it is. The sacrifice was on Calvary, once for all. There my Passover Lamb was slain. There were my sins atoned for; and of that death the Lord's Supper is the simple ordained figure, type, symbol, and representation. That is the reason why there is all the difference in the world (though Augustine failed to see it) between "the representation of a sacrifice," and "a representative sacrifice." I commemorate Christ's death, and in so doing I draw from the Heavenly Treasury, the precious blessings that flow from His death. I do not want my devotion diverted and distracted by all these feeble unauthorized Roman symbols. "O but," says one, "you make the sacraments *empty signs of an absent Lord*." This sort of language (which has unhappily crept in where it should never have appeared) deserves a little notice, and I will give it a reply, and we

will say something too about the words, "an absent Lord;" and then we shall be able to deal with Mr Orby Shipley as has been promised to you.

I have read a good deal about "bare and empty signs," in Greek, in Latin, and in English writers; and it almost always comes from those who want to make out the direct opposite to the sacraments being the blessed and fruitful sign of Christ's body. It comes from those who want to prove that there is a presence of the *real natural body itself*, in some way or other. Some say, "we will not dispute about the mode of the presence of Christ's body. The Romans are wrong in fixing upon the mode of trans-substantiation, and Luther was wrong in fixing the mode of con-substantiation. We only say Christ's body is there in some mode or other." To ALL such, I reply, "But Christ's body is not there *in any mode at all*—in any mode whatever." "His natural body (you remember) is *in Heaven and not here*." So the signs are empty "signs," as they are empty of His body; just as the sepulchre was empty, after He had risen; and as to "an absent Lord," His body is absent, for it is in Heaven and not here. But do we say that such empty signs are empty of blessing, "merely commemorative"? I say solemnly, God forbid the very thought. They are as *full* of Christ to each of us, as we have faith to receive. And, again, does the absence of *the body* cause the absence of *Christ Himself*,—of Christ the Son of God? No, His Divine presence is with us, though His human presence is not. And when He said "Lo! I am with you," He meant His Divine presence,—His presence as God; and not His presence as man; for the manhood is at God's right hand in Heaven; it is in Heaven, and not here: and so of all similar passages.

We partake then of His most precious body and blood "in a figure;" for the body is as far away from us as earth is from Heaven. There should be no mistake about this; for Hallam argues that the presence of a natural body is a question of yes or no. It is here, or it is there; and if it is there, it is not here. But some go to illustrations. "The sun is *present by his rays*." I reply that it is a good thing that his rays only are present, and that the sun is not present, for from all we learn about tens of thousands of miles of burning gas being but a jet of his photosphere or circumvolute of fire, we and our globe should be at once reduced to a cinder. The sun's rays are present, but the sun is not; and so Christ's *grace* is present, but Christ's body is not. But again, as to Christ's body being a source *in itself* of benefits. Is it not a pure fiction of mistaken persons? The body of Jesus did not raise the woman's only daughter: the body only uttered Christ's words; the body or hand touched, but the Spirit of Christ did the miracle.

It was Christ, not Christ's mere touch, that raised her. And so now it is Christ that blesses us in the Supper, not His body, even if it were there. But though He is present in His Godhead, His body is not: it is in Heaven, and not here.

One thing more about absence and presence. Surely never was a greater error of language and of thought than to say or to imagine that Christ's manhood is present wherever His Godhead is present, and, therefore, that if the Son of God is omnipresent, His body is omnipresent too. Remember, the Godhead and the manhood are united, "*not by confusion of substance*, but only by unity of person." The Deity that is everywhere is united to the manhood that is in Heaven.

May I take an illustration from the most exact of sciences? If a marble is tied to the earth's sphere, Is that marble *present* at the earth's antipodes? Is it everywhere wherever the earth is? Or is it anywhere but just at the part where it is united? Just so the manhood of Christ, limited in nature, whether glorified or not, is present where it touches the Godhead in heaven, and not in any other spot or place whatever of the universal presence of His Godhead. O, if people would but enlarge and raise their ideas of the unbounded majesty of God, methinks they would not be confusing its capacity with the bounded nature of any manhood, even with that spotless manhood which the Son of God took upon Him for our full salvation. O, Christ's body may, well be absent from the earth, for it occupies but a small space, at most, in Heaven. But His Deity is everywhere; it encircles me on every side; I find it on every hand; I am never out of its boundless omnipresence, or absent from it at all; and it never leaves me, nor is absent from me. But the very glory of the body of Christ is, that it is really man. As a man it suffered; and as a man it sits on the right hand of the eternal throne: and I find in the Son of God who is united to it, unbounded power everywhere. But I find the human sympathy in the Son of Man, who is raised above the heavens, who is passed into Heaven.

Men and brethren, we ascend in thought at times into the highest places, but we have to come down and fulfil our duties on earth; and so have we now to descend from these nobler thoughts, and to deal in the spirit of Christian truth and honour with the book of the Rev. Mr Orby Shipley. The details about him are as follows: He is not marked as having taken any honours at Cambridge; and he appears to be simply an author; no mention being made of any cure or curacy that he has ever held. His first publication was on the Four Cardinal Virtues, and he advocated in a note *the disunion of Church and State*. The second publication was an "Ecclesiastical Glossary." More lately

he published the "Female Glory: Life of the Holy Virgin," price 10s. 6d. But his chief notoriety is as an Essayist, on his own account, and in connection with others, on church questions. I now proceed to the preface of his book, which has fifty pages of close print, 12mo. The book itself has 218 pages besides. But what is the nature of this book?

He says, his book is "to furnish a hand-book to the priest, at the "time of Divine Service." We had thought that our Book of Common Prayer was the one and only guide; and that the Clergy had promised to use it in public, and "*none other.*" Yet he mentions "previous "Altar-Books of much value, which have adapted fewer portions or "more of the *missal* of the Western (*i.e.* of the Roman) Canon of the "Mass, and with greater or less success have *incorporated them with the "Office of the Church of England.*" We pause here a moment. It takes away our breath! Many Altar-books published, combining sundry parts of the Romish Prayer Book of the Mass with the Church of England Communion Service, for public use in Churches! Could you have believed this? You, at least, that are old enough to remember thirty or forty or fifty years back—could you have expected to hear of the use of many Altar-books in public in our own Churches! Many parts of the idolatrous Mass-book blended with our admirable and (I say it after much inquiry and consideration) our almost and, might I not say, our altogether Protestant Communion Service! Is it not amazing, that to such an extent have disloyalty and defection spread, as to have brought the public services in so many of our Churches so far into conformity with the public services in the Churches in communion with Rome? I cannot abstain from saying, that if any one thing above all other puts the Church of England in danger, it is such a thing as this. Perhaps some of you have been startled to read the language of that good scholar, the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, Dr Ellicott; that a *bona fide* conspiracy, of wide extent, has been formed, and is going on, to transfer our Church to the allegiance of the Communion of Rome. I fancy that by hearing the little which I have already quoted from these two books, you see that the Bishop's strong assertion is fully justified. But we must go on. Mr Shipley explains that those "many Altar-" books were not deemed by many to have *enough* of the Canon of the "Mass of Rome incorporated with them, so that they had to be supplemented by Manuscript Additions or Printed Translations from the "same source." But he thinks that his present work, "the Ritual of "the Altar" "will be found to contain *all the prayers and every direction* "from the Ordinary and Canon of the Mass, by which the Liturgy of the "English Church may be supplemented from those rich stores of Ritual

“and devotion, which are contained in the venerable Latin type of the “office for offering the Eucharistic Sacrifice.” So *he* has laboured to do the business thoroughly; and now every rubric and every prayer of the Romish Mass-book, that is at all suitable for our use, is printed in the same volume with our own Communion Service, in order that Clergymen may, to so great an extent, break their promise at every celebration of this holy rite, and may from time to time add more and more to our Service from the Canon of the Mass of the Church of Rome, in proportion as they find their congregations willing to bear it. Mark this, I pray you. In page 42, he says, “It is wise in the Priest to accuse” tom his people to revived catholic customs with as little as may be to “scandalize them. So it is of much importance in the use of the devotions,” (*i.e.* the interpolated parts from the Mass-book), “to abstain “from lengthened *interruptions in the course of Divine Worship.*” Now, for the meaning of this. I gather from this and from other passages, that the way of procedure is this: The officiating Minister cannot pronounce aloud anything not printed in our own Book of Common Prayer without peril of a suit at law; but he can pause while a piece is being recited by him from the Mass-book, as directed in Mr Shipley’s book, but that portion he cannot utter aloud, he must say it to himself; and any of his people who are sufficiently enlightened by his Shilling Manual, “The Divine Liturgy and Daily Sacrifice,” 11th Edition, published for their use by Masters, can be reciting to themselves whatever it gives them from or concerning those same Mass-book Prayers, which the Priest is repeating to himself. Thus a Bishop cannot touch the Minister, because the Bishop can prove nothing beyond the Minister’s having in hand these Supplementary Prayer Books of Mr Shipley’s, and making pauses according to them. But what do you think is Mr Shipley’s justification and apology for doing this? To make assurance doubly sure, I first take from page twenty, another utterance of the declaration about this book. “Every prayer that *could* be incorporated with, and each rubric that could be adapted to the use of our “own Office, has been transplanted from the Ordinary and Canon of “the Latin Mass into the Liturgy of the Church of England.” And now what is his defence for doing this? “To that form of words to “which we are *by our position pledged,*” (*i.e.* the Church of England Service), “have been added *those other forms, to which* we are only in “one degree less related; *to which* we have a proper and filial right; “and to which our homage is only one degree less due than to the Church of England.” That is to say, because we are born, as the Pope wrote to the German Emperor, within the geographical bounds of the Western branch of the Holy Catholic Church, we are members of that



Church by Divine obligation: and, 1st, we have a proper right, as sons of that Western Church (of which no legislation can deprive us), to use its Mass Services; and, 2nd, our homage is only one degree less due to that Church than to the Church of England. Putting it the other way—the Church of England is only one degree more entitled to their allegiance, and one degree more in possession of a right to demand that all these Ministers should obey her and use her appointed Services, than *the Church of Rome* is entitled to their allegiance, and can demand that these Ministers should use *her* Mass Service too, as far as they can bring it in. I only wonder how much this one degree of difference is. And I now ask, Whether you do not entirely justify Bishop Ellicott's arraigning them as in a conspiracy to carry over our Church stealthily and by degrees into the lap of Rome? Is the Bishop right or is he not? Has he at all overstated the facts? And what think you, Christian Brethren and Christian Sisters, of the morality of this whole movement, of which Mr Shipley's book is a part? We speak plainly. The case requires it. Is there not a cause?

Do any of you doubt whether Mr Shipley can mean all this? Well, I honour you for doubting it as long as you can. But what will you say to his words in page 18, "But a further and more powerful argument," Mr Shipley says, may be adduced for the practice he recommends (and what are his words?), "For employing *additional devotions secreto*." "Additional devotions secreto, and optional *Rubrics* openly, in our "Office of the Mass." I must tell you that in a note, page 18, he justifies "the *return* to this old English word, Mass," though our Reformers, as you know, pointedly cast it away. He also there justifies returning to the term, "saying Mass," in the time of "celebrating the Holy Communion." But I proceed. In a note, page 19, he justifies his secret "additions" on the ground that Bishop Overall, in his time, used to interpolate a Romish Prayer in the Service. In the same way further on, he justifies "*reserving* the consecrated bread," to be used again in Services without fresh consecration. This is a very old custom. There is "a Liturgy of this Presanctified" in connection with it, printed in "the Divine Liturgies;" and Mr Shipley justifies the practice, because the late Bishop Longley used once, as he says, to allow it to be done. All this is in the face of our Church's saying in the Article, "It is not to be reserved or lifted up." But once more, to prove to you that Mr Shipley does recommend the use of *ex secreto additions*, taken from the Canon of the Roman Mass; hear how he justifies it, page 16, "The lawfulness of these additions will eventually be "recognised, when it is *further perceived* that nothing incongruous, or out "of harmony with the mind of the English Church, has been inserted

"within the limits of her Liturgy." This he thinks wants a note to help it off, lest it should appear to any one absolutely untrue. What is the note? "The mind of the Church" (he does not now say the mind of the *English Church*, but *the mind of the Church*), "must be interpreted in a CATHOLIC SENSE." "Why?" He gives this reason—"Inasmuch as the Church of to-day is identically the same (in essence, in authority and power, in faith and sacraments) with the Ancient Church." What is this but insinuating that, let English Reforming Authorities decree what they will; let our Reformed Rule be what it may; let present authority put forth what additional orders it pleases; nothing will have any validity with them: they have simply to say, "they cannot believe any thing is meant by us contrary to the catholic sense of the Church. It would be too dreadful to suppose such a thing." So authorities may enjoin, and Mr Shipley's friends may subscribe; but it does not alter the case: they are not bound, *if it is against Catholic Antiquity!* So Mr Shipley continues, "The Prayers" (*i. e.* the *ex secreto* additions), "which the *celebrant* is directed to pray," (directed, *i. e.* by Mr Shipley's book) "are those which *Catholic Christendom in its Western phase* has sanctioned; with which therefore a Catholic Priest may *loyally* worship." Loyally—to whom? Why to the Western Branch of the Catholic Church, not loyally to the Church of England. "The Rubrics which he is *enjoined to observe* are those which the same august body" (*i. e.* the Communion of the West, *i. e.* of Rome) "has for ages employed, and which, therefore, Anglican Clergy may lawfully adopt." I think you are now satisfied as to what Mr Shipley's recommendations are; and you have some idea by what authorities his followers feel themselves bound; and by what authorities they do not feel themselves bound at all. There is, nevertheless, in his preface, a long and subtle chain of similar sophistry, whether they are bound by England's Supreme Court of Appeal, page 45.

You can at once understand such terms in it, as "State Tyranny in Church Government." "Secular Interference in matters Spiritual." "Judge-made Law," &c., ending "*We* elect to obey God and the Divine Law," (*i. e.* Catholic Antiquity), "rather than man and human law." This sort of conclusion is said to have been well met, by a late Bishop of London. He objected to a young Clergyman's wearing one of the newly introduced clerical robes. "O, my lord," said the young man, "I wear it on the authority of St Ambrose." "I would have you know," said the Diocesan, "that Ambrose is not your Bishop; but I am." And his lordship might have added, "and that you do not belong to the Church of Milan, or to the Church as it was in the Fourth Century, but to the Church of England."

I have told this story because I partly imagine you have had almost enough, at least from me, here to night, about Mr Orby Shipley and his singular reasonings. I am fonder of strong arguments than of violent words: but ought I not to say, that his conclusions are nothing short of excuses for Ecclesiastical Rebellion? What would be said in secular matters, if a person shook himself free from some civil laws that he did not like, on the plea that they were not comprehended in the Pandects of Justinian, or in the Laws of the Emperor Julian? But they will reply, "O, but the Church is different! She has Divine Authority." It is just to that point that these gentlemen must come at last—the Divine Authority of the Church, by which she has trodden on the necks of sovereign and people too; only we happen at the Reformation to have cast off this so-called Divine Supremacy of the Roman Church, or of any Church. "General Councils may err, and have erred, even in matters of faith," and "they can only be called at the Sovereign will of Princes;" another Sovereignty than the Pope's. Away, then, with the dominion of the General Western Church over us. We acknowledge it not. We are free to obey our Queen, and to pass and to maintain and obey whatever laws we think proper and right.

We are a British church, under the constitution of the British Empire. The authorities of our country make our church's laws; for we are constitutionally represented by our whole constituted authorities, according to the legal framework of our land. Disestablish the church; and she may go, or any part of her may go, and nestle under the wing of the Pope. But at present the body of the English people have to make fitting laws for our church. In a word, commons, lords, and queen, prescribe to us our rights and liberties; and our national courts of law, with our judges at the head, interpret the laws on which our rights and liberties in church, as in state, stand. What kind of rights and liberties in church matters would you, the laity, and we, the working clergy, yea, and the dignified clergy, and the bishops too, enjoy under the shadowy but very substantial tyranny of Roman ritualism (*i.e.* with the Roman Curia, as the sole expounder of rites, and services, and dues of all kinds)? perhaps you have already received some idea.

It were very easy to continue, twenty minutes or half-an-hour longer, similar portions with "secret additions, and open rubrics," which Mr Shipley prints to use with our Communion Service. I could make you feel more pain and more indignation than you have felt yet. There is no lack of matter to arouse half-sleeping Protestantism! I confess I shrink from it. It is a kind of desecration. The supper of the Lord is a sacred thing, though it has, in the mass, become the

chosen dwelling-place of much superstition; yes, I must say it, "of many an unclean and hateful bird." Yes, I believe the corruptions of the sacred supper are, verily, guilty things in the sight of God, and have done immeasurable evil in the world. Must I give you one specimen? Perhaps I ought to do so—one specimen, I assure you, out of scores that I could adduce, and I think it will suffice. It is in p. 66 in English, and in the opposite page in Latin. It shows what Mr Shipley makes of this part of the prayer at consecrating the bread and wine, in this sacrament. "Who, in the same night that He was betrayed, took bread: and when He had given thanks, He brake it "and gave it to His disciples, saying 'Take, eat.'" I have not mentioned the interpolated open Rubrics up to this point; but here is a long one, after our Rubric about the minister putting his hand on the bread; "And here holding the host with the thumb and fore-finger of both hands, and bowing his head over the altar, he shall pronounce the words of consecration, distinctly and attentively, in one breath and without pause;" then follow, in the largest capitals, as in the Roman mass-book, the gracious and simple, but much perverted and misunderstood words of Jesus, "This is My body which is given for you," and then a second open Rubric, "Having said the words of consecration, he shall immediately genuflect," (*i.e.* kneel) "and worship, then rise and elevate the host, while he repeats the words 'Do this in remembrance of Me.'" Then follows a third open Rubric; "Then he shall replace the host on the paten, and again worship; and shall not disjoin his fingers and thumbs except when the host must be handled, until after the ablutions. Then, having uncovered the chalice, or if at high mass, the deacon having uncovered it, he shall proceed, and so with the cup in a similar way." Then another open Rubric; "Then he shall replace the chalice on the corporal, or if at high mass the deacon shall cover it with the pall, and again worship." The Latin on the opposite page is for the more advanced churches. "Kneeling, he adores; arises, shews it to the people, sets it down, covers it, and again adores."

Spare me from all comment. It is too humbling and too sad that this should be done in many churches of our yet Protestant communion!

If I have thus ventured to take two books that have come within my reach, and to open to you a little of "the perilous stuff," and foreign ritual, that they contain and recommend, and if I exhort you and all the freemen of England, to look to your rights and liberties, and to your present control over England's church, that they may not be unawares, on some sudden political emergency, violently wrenched from

your grasp ; and if I most earnestly recommend, that you should make yourselves masters of these questions, and talk of them, with your Protestant wives, and with your sons and your daughters, the pillars and flowers of your English Protestant homes ; may not I also, in giving this good advice to you all, fall back on the title of my lecture and say, Is there not a cause ?

*Note.* This lecture was printed entire in the widely circulated County Paper about two months before the Primate in the House of Lords called public attention to these things and brought forward and exposed certain cards to be used in congregations for the very purposes here delineated. The Primate has also expressed, in words which have become historical, a conviction that a conspiracy is formed for introducing alien doctrines and practices, particularly from the Roman Communion, into the English Church. I need not here cite his Grace's well-known language. I only call attention to the fact that this lecture was delivered and the following correspondence arose before and not after the great movement on this subject in our House of Peers.

Of the consequences of the Archbishop's open statement in the House of Lords it would be premature to express an estimate, for although between four and five years have passed, the Greek proverb holds, "We are yet in the rue."

Every one knows that it was thought expedient to insert in Mr Gurney's Bill for the purification of Public Worship a clause empowering each Bishop to put a stop to any process which he may think unadvisable. The effect of this may be traced in the following extract from a London paper of Dec. 27, 1878, which I give without the names and without note or comment. It describes the present decision of the Diocesan regarding the rites to be used in three churches, as to which an appeal had been made. "The right rev. prelate disallows altar-lights, "the mixing of the chalice during the administration of the Holy Communion, circular wafers, and the signing of the communicants with the "Sacrament before delivering it to them ; but he declines to forbid the "use of stoles, the Eastward Position, the singing of the Agnus Dei, "processions of clergy and choir at entering the church, elevation, at "least to a certain extent, the kneeling of the priest after receiving in "either kind, the washing of the sacred vessels in the church at the "close of the service, bowing towards the Holy Table ; the use of a "credence ; and the placing of a metal cross on the altar-ledge." Is the Reformation to stop where we are ? Can it stop there ? Must it not go backward or forward ? But this may well introduce the fifth of the following letters, which happens not to have been destroyed.

## FOUR LETTERS IN THE SAME COUNTY PAPER.

---

### LETTER I.

#### *On Mr Hebert's late Lecture.*

SIR,

If I venture to make a few observations on Mr Hebert's lecture, as reported in your last number, it is not wholly, if indeed it be more than slightly, in consequence of his having singled me out as the object of *personal remark*, and occupied no small part of the time at his disposal with an account of a certain work of mine. To adopt the motto of his lecture, "Is there not a cause?" when misrepresentations, however unintentional, are made, which are calculated to mislead the ill-informed, to stir up bad feeling, and to give our enemies occasion to rejoice by proclaiming, truly or untruly, that dissensions, which he considers so grave, exist within our Zion?

Mr Hebert is evidently aware that my book is to a great extent a repertory of antiquarian knowledge. When, therefore, he found that those details of mediæval Ritualism, which he thought good to extract from it, excited such "surprise" and "sensation" among his hearers, would it not have been better, let me ask, if he had warned them a little more plainly not to suppose that I must admire everything that I had occasion to mention?—if, for example, he had said something like this: "Now, pray do not misunderstand me. I do not wish to bear 'false witness against my neighbour. The author gives us no reason to 'suppose that he wishes to introduce the Fan, the Asterisc, the Air, '&c., among us. In fact his feeling against an excessive and unmeaning 'ritual is shown in several places in the book." If he had had the means of knowing it, he might have added that no one has written more than myself against that favourite practice of the so-called "Ritualists," non-communicating attendance, and those other innovations to which it ministers. I assume that he did not know this; for my writings on those subjects are not mentioned in the list which he has given.

But there is one passage in the lecture on which I must particularly remark. Mr Hebert quotes me as saying, "It appears to me that there

"would be a great advantage in this [the] rule if it could now be introduced among ourselves ... that the altar should be covered, &c. ; it "would mark, in a very striking manner, the beginning of the more "sacred part of the holy office." Upon this he observes, "So he wishes "the corporal pall to be adopted in our churches." [Sensation.] What I wrote (p. 304) was as follows : "that the altar should be covered "*between the Nicene Creed, or the Sermon, and the Offertory.* It would "not only meet some existing inconveniences, but would mark," &c. Now my meaning lies in the words which I put in Italics, but which Mr Hebert omits. He surely cannot be ignorant that the Church orders that "the table at Communion-time shall have a fair white linen "cloth upon it." It is simply this to which I referred. We are not told *when* to cover the table with it. It is generally done before Morning Prayer ; but I ventured to suggest that a better time would be after the Nicene Creed. The reasons may not be apparent to those who have not considered the matter well ; but the remark is certainly not worthy of the "sensation" which Mr Hebert created by his comment on my mutilated sentence.

Now I am very glad that Mr Hebert has made this strange mistake. It may suggest to him and to those who heard him a wholesome doubt whether he has quite understood that far more serious subject in reference to which he says that I contradict myself. I shall not enter on it here. It is no fit matter for such a discussion as the unhappy ventilation of it before a mixed and excited audience on Monday last would naturally prelude. The key to Mr Hebert's difficulty on this point lies in those Scriptures to which he refers his hearers. May he and they find it, as the answer to prayer and the reward of quiet study pursued in devout retirement, as unto Him who seeth in secret, and use it when found to their soul's health and to His glory.

If, in conclusion, I say a little about myself, perhaps the occasion will in a kindly judgment be thought to justify it. My idol through life, if I have had one, has been historical truth. A revealed religion must have its roots in the soil of history, and indifference to historical truth must end in indifference to religion. With this conviction I cannot be a party man, though my independence may sometimes give offence and cause me to be misunderstood. I can admire men of all parties, and sympathise with them in many things ; but I have never found them the better for party spirit and party action. My constant aim and desire, therefore, has been simply to approve myself as a consistent member and minister of the Church of England, which I *know*, upon every relevant ground of assurance, to be the most faithful of any in the world to Holy Scripture, as interpreted to us by

the teaching and practice of primitive Christendom. Those who stand on this solid foundation will be little affected by the well-meant but mistaken denunciations of Mr Hebert and his friends; but it may be far otherwise with younger, less instructed, and less stable persons. A long and sad experience has shown how surely the sense of injustice will by degrees incline a too dependent or over-sensitive mind to seek peace wherever it is promised, though apart from truth and right. The Church Association is thus at the present time the great, though unconscious, ally of Rome. Nothing of course can wholly excuse impatience of trials which God permits, or the choices of self-will, the pride of private judgment, or levity of change; but will they be accounted free from guilt, who by their misdirected zeal have created the temptation for their weak brother?

Mr Roebuck has lately called for a *National* party. Are we never in his sense to see a *Church* party? When will men learn to proclaim and act out their unity in essentials, and cease to magnify and aggravate their differences in lesser matters? When will they endeavour to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace?

W. E. SCUDAMORE.

## LETTER II.

### *On the Rev. Mr Scudamore's Letter.*

SIR,

A few words are due from me both to your readers and to Mr Scudamore in answer to his letter. He must not take it amiss that I do not plead guilty to his two charges. First, I cannot confess that by omitting the words which he sets in italics I led to any mistake, seeing they were only omitted for brevity, and words in every respect equivalent had just been given by me. His words which I omitted are "between the Nicene Creed or the Sermon and the Offertory," and I had said "the point in the Service in which after the Sermon the minister returns to the Lord's Table to begin reading the sentences of the offertory." I had thus taken pains to point out the very time when Mr Scudamore wants the pall to be spread. His quotations given by me say again and again "after the offertory."

But I must add a little about corporal palls. The Reformers knew all about them, and they avoided the words entirely. But did they retain the thing? First, "the fair linen cloth" spread on the table cannot be a corporal pall, at least if my dictionary of Patristic Latinity



is right, for it defines "corporale," that which covers the sacrifice. A pall alone may be almost any cloth of state and honour; but a corporal pall is, with them, that which covers the sacramental elements. Now our Reformers, in the Book of Common Prayer, appoint no covering for the bread and wine at all, but only for what is left after all have communicated—for the sake, I suppose, of decent respect. So little feeling had they towards the mediæval corporal pall, and so little inclined would they have been to adopt Mr Scudamore's proposal.

His second charge is that of omission, viz. that I ought to have said that (1) he was opposed to "unmeaning ceremonies." Why the spirit of all my lecture was that there is only *too much meaning* in all these ceremonies, only that their aim is Romish—by Romish ritual to cover and introduce Romish doctrine. (2) I ought to have given him credit for opposing the retaining of non-communicants in Church; and, most of all, (3) that I ought not to think that he wishes these things, or any of them, except I suppose the corporal pall, introduced into our churches and into those of America and the colonies. I certainly did not say that he had no such wish, for I did not so interpret his book. Why, Sir, if our present Primate was obliged to utter expressions of warning in his first charge, and the practices which he reprehended are known to be growing almost daily, may I not look upon many portions of the Church as occupied with persons, who, to my eye, are very like boys fond of playing with fire, and putting the Church in the greatest possible danger? Then what would one think of that man who gathered from all ages receipts for these dangerous fireworks and scattered them wide amongst these boys? Is not he in a great degree responsible for the consequences?

Yours very faithfully,

CHARLES HEBERT.

ST MARGARET'S, LOWESTOFT, March 10, 1874.

### LETTER III.

SIR,

It was ill-advised of Mr Hebert to deliver, where and as he did, his crude sentiments on mysteries so deep, so inscrutable, and so awful; having been delivered, it had been well if the lecture had been suffered to pass and be forgotten. Theologians will easily point out the mistakes and fallacies of the effusion, but, in addressing on such topics the "unlearned and unstable," who cannot know how entirely similar heresies have been demolished by the greatest minds, to them as to

children, *maxima debetur reverentia*; only on grave occasions, with all solemnity of utterance, should those dread mysteries be unfolded.

It is not my province to defend the most consummate divine in the diocese, to say the least, from the quite unfounded aspersions of the lecturer; I leave him in that gentleman's hands, and I must say I do not envy him.

But I hope, on account of those who will certainly be endangered, that I may be allowed, with all the brevity possible, to expose the most glaring and most deplorable of the fallacies in the place where they have been detailed at such length and with so much particularity.

Respecting that most awful and inscrutable of mysteries, the human nature of Christ and His presence with His commissioned agents in the Church, Mr Hebert has three or four strange propositions. The first, that Christ rose from the tomb in the same condition of body in which He had lived and was crucified; the second, that there is distinction between a real body and a spiritual; he says that a spiritual body is not a real body. (This second proposition may be briefly dismissed; for if it be predicated of anything that is a body, it must be a real body.) The third proposition of Mr Hebert's is, that Christ's body will not assume its glorified condition until His second coming.

With regard to the first proposition,—whereas divines have alleged the Lord's appearance among His disciples when the doors were shut *for fear of the Jews*, in proof of a spiritual body, Mr Hebert is content to assert (of his own knowledge) that the doors were *somehow* opened for Him, in opposition to Dr Hammond, and I believe all divines of eminence. But what is of more importance, he affirms that the Sacred Body which arose from the tomb, which ascended into Heaven, which sitteth at the Supreme right hand, is identically the same with that which was crucified; not only in essence, but in conditions. This is self-confuted by its consequence; for in professing to pass without explanation the means and manner how it was nourished during the forty days' converse with the disciples, Mr Hebert implies, of necessity, that in Heaven it must need earthly nourishment. (Mr Hebert must here be credited with a new heresy; unless, indeed, he have borrowed the notion from Swedenborgianism.) But if that nourishment is not needed, what becomes of the assertion that Christ's body at the right hand of the Father is in all respects identical with our natural bodies, *sin only excepted*?

Mr Hebert, fourthly, asserting (truly) that the Sacred Body is always, until the discomfiture of his foes, at the Supreme right hand, maintains that Christ is present with us only in His Divine nature; thus separating His Divine nature from His humanity, which amounts

to that heresy of "dividing the substance" condemned by the Catholic Church, and by that English branch of it whereof Mr Hebert is a minister. Neither is the Divine nature alone, nor the human nature alone, Christ, but the inseparable union of both; if, therefore, Christ be not present with us in the body, He is not at all present.

I make no doubt of Mr Hebert's honest zeal and right intention, but it were well he should on such deep subjects apply to himself the *argumentum ad verecundiam*.

EDW. WILSON.

RECTORY, TOPCROFT.

#### LETTER IV.

*On the Rev. Mr Wilson's Letter.*

SIR,—The object alike of lectures and letters is truth. I welcome Mr Wilson's entrance, and he will not complain if I find objections to some of his statements. He remarks on what he terms my first proposition, "Mr Hebert asserts (of his own knowledge) that the doors "were somehow opened for our Lord, in opposition to Dr Hammond, "and, I believe, *all divines of eminence*." My enquiry was whether the Scripture says that they were not opened. My words were, "Who "tells us that He went through closed doors? Why His mere word "or will could have opened or closed them. Leave that matter. He "could choose His own way." I had looked into Hammond on St John. He is silent on the subject in his commentary on John xx. But "all other divines of eminence" are in opposition, at least Mr Wilson *believes* they are. Whom shall I select as most answering to Mr Wilson's idea of a divine of eminence, both regarding the coming through closed doors, and this being a proof that Christ's body was already changed? I fancy Mr Wilson would set Dr Whitby very high. He writes thus on John xx. 19, "Though it be an ancient opinion "that Christ made His body to penetrate through the doors, yet it is "both groundless and absurd, and contrary to the very design of "Christ in coming to them. It is groundless, for why might not "He by His power secretly open the doors, His disciples not perceiving it, as the angel opened the prison doors and gates to let out "Peter, Acts xii. 10? It is absurd, for since Christ *rose in that natural "body* which was crucified and laid in the grave, philosophy informs us "that such a body could not penetrate through another more solid

"body ; and to this agree those words of Cyril of Alexandria, 'It is impossible that one body should go through another without cutting 'it or being cut;' and, thirdly, this fancy destroys not only the end of Christ's then coming to them, but of all that He had said and done to convince them it was the same body that was crucified, *in which He appeared to them.*" And there is about as much more to the same effect ; as also more on Luke xxiv.

Whom shall I adduce besides ? It is almost a matter of option. There are so many. Lange's Bibelwerk, though opposed to my views, quotes Baumgarten, Crusius, "the doors had suddenly opened to the nod of His divine Majesty." But I was last week using Cardinal Cajetan, the rival of Bellarmine, as an interpreter of the New Testament on the Papal side after the Reformation. He says on the same chapter, regarding the body of our Lord, "Christ not only by words but by deeds testifies that He is the same that was crucified by showing to them His hands and His side. Hence we learn that in the hands and feet and side were the signs of the nails and the lance. For He showed them His hands and His side for this purpose, that by the signs of the nails and the lance they might know that *they were the same hands, that it was the same side.*" Or St Luke xxiv., on the words *handle me*, he says, "The flesh of Christ was of the same nature after His resurrection as before."

Would it not be surplusage to adduce many other writers to shew that all eminent writers are *not* in opposition, especially as I merely argued from these questions from Holy Scripture, stating most carefully that my argument against the human body of our Lord being present in many places at once equally holds true if our Lord's body was in a glorified state when He rose. I wished to establish the argument of our Church, that the natural body of Christ is in heaven and not on earth, "It being contrary to the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one." To that question all the light of Holy Scripture regarding the kind of body which rose from the grave is evidently most important.

I have not brought forward commentators whom Mr Wilson might hesitate to term eminent. Perhaps I had better translate what Beza says, as his commentary on the New Testament is most highly esteemed, on John xx. 19 : "*Either, therefore, the doors of that house where they assembled opened of their own accord, or even the walls themselves were passable by Him, &c.* Those, however, who gather that the body of Christ, after His resurrection, was subject to no limitations of place, and hence at last slip away to the opinion that the body of Christ *is present everywhere* in an invisible manner—I can-

"not say by what kind of reason they learn to draw such inferences."

I much wish your space allowed me to make a yet more valuable quotation from Chemnitz, Doctor and Superintendent in the Church of Brunswick, from his book on the two natures in Christ, which I happened to use the week before. He of course knew, like Whitby, that the chief early fathers, Augustin, Jerome, Ambrose, Hilary, and others, held to Christ's passing through closed doors, and another opinion too, to which I cannot allude; and yet he, like Cajetan, throws it aside, and, with it, all the various explanations of Christ's body being present in several places at once. He casts them all over as untenable. Then how does he escape believing with us that Christ's expression, "This is my body," is a figure? He simply says that the omnipotence of God can do physical impossibilities. We should say it is much easier to believe that Christ spoke in a figure when he said, "This is my body," as St Paul said, "That rock *was* Christ," "This Agar *is* Mount Sinai in Arabia," as we heard read yesterday.

I have neither time nor inclination to note Mr Wilson's terms respecting my lecture as "ill-advised and crude:" and, regarding charges two and three I may be short. My lecture says or implies (1) Body is real, of whatever kind; (2) It is only *present* in one limited place at one time; and the words "real" and "really" are superfluous respecting body; and I was far from saying that Christ had two bodies. I said that the natural body was to become a spiritual or glorified body, 1 Cor. xv.

But as briefly as possible I must touch upon one error near the end of his letter. He says that my assertion that "Christ is present with us only in His Divine nature is separating His Divine nature from His manhood, which amounts to the heresy of *dividing the substance*, condemned by the Catholic Church and by that English branch of it of which Mr Hebert is a minister." I need only say let him turn to the Athanasian Creed referred to, and he will see that "neither confounding the Persons nor dividing the substance" is in the first part of that creed; and refers to the *three Persons in the Godhead* being of one substance, although they are three Persons; and therefore it does not belong to the relation between Christ's Godhead and His humanity.

CHARLES HEBERT.

LOWESTOFT, March 16th, 1874.

THE following letter, suppressed in 1874, because of Dr ——'s death, is added here, not only on account of the important subject it raises, but also in reference to Mr Orby Shipley, of whom we are now reading in the public papers that in obedience to a kind of moral gravitation he has, at length, through Monsignor Capel's influence, been drawn over and absorbed into the great communion of Rome.

November, 1878.

SIR,—Dr ——'s letter, dated Monday, August 10, gives the impression that he does not think a clergyman's standing with his back to the people, when he is using "The consecration prayer" at the Lord's supper, is *in itself of any consequence*, if we did not "make it of consequence:" and that he thinks the way to return to peace in the church of England is to make that and some other disputed points *optional*; and he has given notice accordingly that he will make a motion in convocation, of which he is a member, in favour of its being made an open question. I know the Doctor by his book on the Lord's supper, and I trust he will excuse me if I put forth a protest against the proposed settlement.

He has a right to my reasons, and I will give them in the words of Cranmer's chaplain, Thomas Becon, from his "comparison between the Lord's Supper and the Pope's Mass," Vol. III. p. 397, Parker Soc.'s Edition, "Christ, when He should minister the mysteries of His body and blood to His disciples, sat (*i. e.* reclined) at a table, *beholding and looking upon them most friendly and familiarly.*" Also he says, "The massmonger altogether dishonestly" (this does not mean *dishonestly*) "and ungently" (this does not mean violently) "*turning himself from the people, standeth at an altar, after the manner of Aharon, his back turned towards the people.*" I have a little softened the last clause.

Sir, I believe that the body of English people will resent and not suffer the clergyman's back to be turned upon them in the consecration prayer, for the very reason which Becon gives, who must have known the mind of our chief Reformers; *viz.* that it is in direct contrariety to what our Lord did or probably would have done; and because it is exactly what *is done* in the Roman canon of the mass; and it is what Mr Orby Shipley recommends in the "General Rubrics" at the end of his book on "The Ritual of the Altar." In a word I am very much persuaded that the mass of the people of England will say, as Becon

implies, that for him that is called the celebrant *then* to turn his back on the people is a practice that has the savour of Popery and not of Scriptural and Protestant Christianity : and therefore for the sake of the church of England herself I hope it will never be made optional.

I have the Roman Mass-book open before me on one side, and the Rev. Orby Shipley's book open before me on the other ; and I do not wish our sacred and Protestant Communion service to be made at all like either the one or the other.

What does Dr —— mean by saying in his book on the Lord's Supper, p. 499 : "The clergy are priests of priests, by whom the "greatest of all possible sacrifices is ministered to them" (the people)? If Dr —— really means us to understand that he holds that the Lord's supper is *a sacrifice* and not only a sacrament, and that in fact he upholds the "altar priest and sacrifice" theory, it would not incline my mind in favour of his recipe for procuring peace to our church at this critical time.

A word more before I close about Chaplain Becon. I apprehend his meaning in the words "most dishonestly and ungently turning away "from the people" to be that no officiating Christian minister would willingly *dishonour* the people and *treat them in so uncourteous a manner* by turning his back upon them and as it were shutting them out from the sacred work going forward ; and that the only reason can be that he deems he has something *in front* of him which deserves a reverence nothing short of adoration, so that all human considerations vanish ; and he therefore places himself "in the middle of the altar *towards it*," and "profoundly bowing, &c. &c.," says, in his heart at least, something of this kind, "These gifts, these offerings, this holy and unspotted sacrifice we offer, &c. &c." Shipley, p. 204.

Is not the time approaching when we in England must eschew "optional rubrics," and be either Roman or English in all things relating to the sacred supper?

Yours faithfully,

CHARLES HEBERT.

LOWESTOFT, August 11, 1874.

## APPENDIX. II.

“WHAT NOTICES OF EVENING COMMUNION ARE TO  
BE FOUND IN THE FATHERS OF THE THIRD AND  
FOURTH CENTURIES ?”

*An Address read at a large Clerical Meeting at Furness Abbey,  
March 14, 1876,*

BY THE REV. CHARLES HEBERT, D.D.,  
VICAR OF AMBLESIDE.

It is known to all who know anything of the early fathers that they generally advocate the reception of the bread and wine in the Lord's supper *in the morning* : and that they generally expressly state that the object in so doing is to receive them into the mouth before men take any other food, deeming this to be a peculiar honour of which the sacred bread and wine are most worthy : and that for this purpose it is desirable to administer the holy communion at an early hour, lest the people be tempted to break their fast before they receive it. It is equally well known that they recognize that the example of our Lord at its institution goes against these opinions and practices, inasmuch as He gave the bread and wine to His apostles, not in the morning, but in the evening, and also gave it at the time when they were at the furthest remove from fasting ; viz. at the time of the Paschal feast, viz. the bread, while they were eating, and the wine, when the feast had concluded—so that no thought of its being desirable that the sacred elements should be taken fasting can be supposed to have been in our Saviour's mind, or could be gathered from the narrative. Thirdly, it is also well known that these fathers rest the above opinions and practices on the ground of the church's decrees ; and some affirm that the church was directed to make such decrees by the teaching of the Holy Ghost. Before this paper closes, extracts will be given from a renowned letter of Augustine, which sets all this forth with great clearness.



Nevertheless, neither Augustine nor any other father ventures upon any proof that the church was taught of the Spirit, or directed by the Apostles, when it gave forth these particular orders and opinions, or that the church goes into any proof that the passages of Scripture to which these fathers refer contain any real sanction of them. Yet the utterances of the fathers, in favour of observing morning communion in order that it may be received fasting, are so general, that an eminent M. P., who is one of the foremost in dealing with church matters in the House of Commons, ventured on an assertion in a pamphlet which he published in November, 1874, and which drew considerable attention, and was amply reviewed in the *Times*—that there is not to be found in any of the early fathers a single word to shew that evening communions were in existence in the early ages. We know that writers differ as to the number of centuries which are to be included in this term, yet all agree to include in it the 3rd and 4th centuries: so that whatever can be extracted from accredited writers of those two centuries, to shew that the practice of evening communions existed then in certain churches, is distinctly to the point in question. Now first, if there be a writer to whom men look as the primary organizer of a rather strong system of visible churchmanship, it is admitted that Cyprian is he. For amid several personal qualities in Cyprian, which all concur in admiring, there stand out strong doctrinal preferences for church authority, about which men are divided: and these make him at least a witness entirely above suspicion, when he records a practice that was adverse to the general current of feeling in the Christian churches. So let us first take in hand some statements of this father.

About the middle of the 63rd letter (others make it Letter 3 of Book II.) to his former teacher Cæcilian, in the midst of a discussion, that both water and wine are necessary in the cup, we fall in with the following words: “An illâ sibi aliquis contemplatione blanditur, quod “etsi mane aquâ solâ offerri videtur, tamen cum ad cœnandum venimus “mixtum calicem offerrimus.” “Does any one solace himself with the “thought, that, although it appears to be offered in the early morning “with water alone, yet when we come to sup (together), we offer the “mixed cup of wine and water?” I pass over the point that some were most wrongly making the offering (as they called it) with water only, without wine in the morning. I have to direct attention to the fact that it was *in the evening* that wine mingled with water was used. Cyprian’s argument is, that its being done by others in what he judged the right way in the evening was no excuse for its being done in a wrong mode in the morning.

Thus it incidentally comes to light that it was administered in

Africa by some in the evening as well as in the morning ; and Cyprian enters no protest against evening communion. How widely in Africa this practice prevailed the passage does not shew. But he continues, "Sed cum cœnamus, ad convivium nostrum *plebem convocare* non possumus, ut sacramenti veritatem (*i.e.* wine and water mingled) "fraternitate omni præsente celebremus." "But when we sup, it is impossible to invite the multitude of the lower classes to our feast, that we may (then) celebrate with all the brethren present together the true and complete sacrament." He wishes that they *could* always have all the common people at these evening feasts ; that thus the whole fraternity might be present when the Lord's supper was administered in its completeness. He then refers to the original institution. "For indeed the Lord did not offer the mingled cup in the morning but after supper" (*i.e.* in the evening). The next sentence ought I think to be printed as a question. "Numquid?" "Ought we then at all to celebrate the Lord's feast after a supper, that we may thus celebrate the mixed cup in the Lord's feast that will be largely frequented?" The Latin is, "Numquid ergo Dominicum post cœnam celebrare debemus ut sic mixtum calicem frequentandis Dominicis celebremus?" He then argues that it was necessary that Christ should offer it in the evening, in order that by the very hour of the sacrifice He might indicate the setting and evening of the world : as also it is written, Exod. xii. "The whole people of the congregation of the children of Israel shall kill it *in the evening*." And again in the Psalms (Ps. 141), "The lifting up of my hands an *evening sacrifice*." "But we celebrate the Lord's resurrection in the morning" (*i.e.* His rising in the morning, and His death in the evening). And he concludes the argument, "Nihil aliud quam quod Ille fecit facere debemus." "We ought not to do any thing different from what He did." It is particularly clear I think that Mr Beresford Hope's readings in the fathers had not embraced this part of this letter of Cyprian to Cæcilian ; for we can hardly imagine it read and forgotten. I have shewn the letter to several friends, who have agreed that it is indisputable, and I have inserted it in two London papers and no one assailed my interpretation of it in either. It is singular that the first witness in chronological order, in these two centuries, to prove that evening communion had not died out in the third century, should be Cyprian !

But Cyprian may be thought a witness only for his own diocese of Carthage. Let us pass to another writer. I read in Sozomenus, one of the two chief historians after Eusebius, p. 636, Migne's Ed. Bk. iv. c. 22, "The churches everywhere in the world perform the mysteries on the Sabbath day in every week ; the Christians in Alexandria, and in

"Rome, from some ancient custom, refuse to do this. But the Egyptians, who are neighbours to the Alexandrians, and those that dwell in the Thebaid maintain assemblies indeed on the Sabbath, *ποιοῦνται συνάξεις*, but do not, as is the custom for Christians, partake of the mysteries (*i.e.* then and there). For after having had good cheer *εὖωχθῆναι*, and being satisfied with food of all kinds, about evening they make their offerings and partake of the mysteries. Again in Alexandria on the fourth day (Wednesday), on the day that is called the preparation (Friday), both the Scriptures are read, and the teachers interpret them, and every part of the communion-service is gone through, except the rite of the mysteries, *πάντα τε τὰ συνάξεως γίνεται δέχα τῆς τῶν μυστηρίων τελετῆς*. And this is the ancient custom at Alexandria; for Origen (a man that being a wise teacher and one that had considered that the impossibility of Moses' law lies in its being too weak to be put into practice to the letter, *πρὸς τὸ γράμμα ἀποδοθῆναι*), seems in those days mostly in the church to have raised the word regarding the passover (*i.e.* the Lord's supper) as consisting in contemplation; saying that it had been truly done only at passover" (*i.e.* at the time of Christ's death). Without putting the doctrine of Origen into the crucible, it is plain that at the seat of the African patriarchate, as well as in other parts of Egypt, evening communion was in practice.

Socrates the historian, p. 1477, Migne's Ed., confirms this, saying, "But with the Egyptians in many cities and villages, contrary to what has been ruled by all Christians in common, *παρὰ τὸ κοινῇ πᾶσι νενομισμένον*, having already had their morning meals, meeting on the Sabbath about evening, *πρὸς ἑσπέραν τῷ σαββάτῳ συνιόντες, ἡρισθηκότις ἤδη*, they partake of the mysteries."

To these is to be added a singular passage of Gregory of Nazianzum, whose name carries us far away to Cappadocia in Asia, and to Constantinople on the shore of Europe. He says, Vol. II. Migne's Ed., Oration 45, p. 644, "On the holy passover," *i.e.* on the Lord's supper, "For this God appears to me to will, that we communicate in things nearest (*i.e.* most in correspondence) to the sacrifice." After describing the Passover night he says, "after that, the taking away of leaven for seven days (for seven is the most mystical of numbers, and corresponds with the creation of the world); and the leaven is the old and strange wickedness of men; for it does not refer to baking bread to support life, &c. &c. And let them indeed lament: *but by us Christians the lamb shall be eaten towards evening*, because the Lord's passion looked to the completion of the ages, &c. &c."

The tenour of this passage can hardly be disputed, as shewing that

in some other regions besides Egypt, contrary to the general custom, evening communions were retained.

On looking at Isidore of Seville, whose summary of practices, rites and doctrines was in general use for centuries (we may perhaps not err if we say that till the time of Peter the Lombard), we do not find one word contradictory of the practice of evening communion, or in assertion of the contrary. A similar remark holds regarding Theophylact, the glorious Bishop of Achris in Bulgaria in the eleventh century.

It remains that we complete the circle of evidence by introducing the letter 118 of Augustine to Januarius, Paris, Ben. Ed. p. 116. And it is the more becoming to produce this letter, as no one can set a limit to the influence of the writings of Augustine. His general and lasting popularity seems to have arisen from his marvellous though most perilous dialectical skill, from his indubitable excellence as a pastor at Hippo at last, and from his championship against Pelagius and other heretics, including the Manicheans (though he never got quite clear from their early influence upon him; as Horace says, "*Quo semel est imbuta recens servabit odorem Testa diu*"). All these points and his singularly beautiful elucidations of the doctrines of grace, have given Augustine in all succeeding ages a control over men's minds, which perhaps surpasses that of all others taken together. Let us take him therefore as a paramount instance of the way in which churches passed down, from the admission of the original institution of the holy supper at evening, into an almost constant authorized use of it both in the morning and during fasting, instead of receiving it after the usual second meal in the evening. But it will be seen that even he recommends or sanctions one annual evening reception. P. 115. "But other things vary locally and in different districts, as when some fast on a Saturday (*sabbato*), others do not. Some daily communicate in the body and blood of the Lord: others receive on certain set days. In some places not a day is allowed to intervene without its being offered. In other places it is offered only on Saturday and the Lord's day..... When my mother followed me to Milan and found the church not fasting on Saturday, she began to be disturbed, &c. And (Ambrose) said to me, 'When I come to Rome I fast on a Saturday, when I am here I do not fast,' &c." P. 116. "A change of custom even such as is helpful, as being useful, is a disturbing thing by being new, &c. The apostle says, 'When ye meet together at one place this is not to eat the Lord's supper': so that he calls the very reception of the eucharist the Lord's supper. It might bias men on the question whether they should either offer or receive the eucharist after having

“on that day taken refreshment, that it is said in the Gospel, ‘But when they were eating Jesus took bread and blessed and brake, &c.’ And it clearly appears that when the disciples first received the Lord’s body and blood, they did not receive it fasting. Is then the universal church to be at all spoken against (*calumniandum*) because it is (now) always received fasting? For thenceforth it was the pleasure of the Holy Spirit (*placuit*), that to the honour of so great a sacrament the Lord’s body should enter a Christian’s mouth before the rest of his food (*margin, cæteri cibi*). For on this account that custom is observed through the whole world, &c. &c. And He did not settle in what order from the first it should be taken, that He might reserve this function (*locum*) for the apostles, through whose hands He was purposing to make arrangements in the churches (*ecclesias dispositurus erat*), &c. &c. But when the apostle is speaking respecting this sacrament, &c. &c., he says, ‘But the other things will I set in order when I come.’ From this we may understand, that it was a tedious matter in that letter to suggest the whole order of service; which the whole church throughout the world is (ever since) observing; and that therefore Paul himself took the ordering of that which no diversity of habits should arise and change. But there are some to whom a certain plausible method has given great pleasure (*viz.*) that, on the one fixed and set day in the year, in which the Lord Himself gave the supper, leave should be given to offer and to receive the Lord’s body and blood after taking our meal (*cibos*), as it were to mark the institution with a more notable commemoration than usual. But I think it would be more becoming (*honestius*) that it should take place at such an hour, that he also who has been fasting should be able to meet at the oblation those who come to it after the refreshment which takes place at the ninth hour (*i.e.* 3 o’clock). Thus we do not by that Lord’s supper compel any one to dine first (*prandere*); but we do not dare to forbid him (*contradicere*). But I think that the reason why this has not been established is, that most and nearly all have been accustomed to take supper on that day. And since there are some that maintain their fast, it is offered in the morning that it may not interfere with those who are going to dine, since the fasting (of some) and the washing of others (after the Lent fast) could not be endured (*side by side*), and it is offered again in the evening for those that fast (till it is over).”

Thus all that has been asserted regarding the mode in which the change from evening communion after the evening meal, to morning communion and fasting has been exhibited from this great writer. The marvel is how, with all these five passages in being, Mr Beresford Hope’s

eye has escaped them all. His exact words are these, in his pamphlet, entitled "Worship in the Church of England," Murray, which was reviewed in the *Times*, Dec. 24, 1874: "The practice of celebrating "the communion in the evening—a practice for which there is not a "word of sanction ... in the immemorial usage of our own or any other "church."

The argument is now concluded ; and it is only required to add that these passages are brought to the front as history, simply that they may receive full consideration ; and that the truth may be known. One does not like ill-grounded assertions to be still ventilated with the utmost confidence, or to be received with an equally groundless belief in their accuracy, when it is so brief and easy a task to shew on what a sandy foundation the imposing structure has been erected.

*Note read at the Clerical Meeting.*

The writer will be much obliged by receiving notice from any clerical brother, who may happen to have fallen in with any other passage in any other centuries shewing the existence of evening communions. When did the practice of evening communions wholly cease? And did the practice revive at all before the German and English Reformations, and how soon, and where first? These are points in history, that he has not had leisure to investigate.

Mr Beresford Hope rightly asserts that there is nothing within the four corners of our Prayer-book to sanction any other than morning communion ; but then neither is there anything in the book of Common Prayer to sanction a sermon in the afternoon or in the evening, or three services in a day, and the consequent using of the evening service twice. Our modern alterations are not as yet introduced into the Prayer-book.

The writer also wishes to ask if anyone has ever heard of a case of disorder in our church now, like that which made the Corinthian church notorious, arising out of the administration of the Lord's supper in the evening. He has not heard of any. It seems that the prevailing reverence for this rite in England may be trusted. The writer merely deals in this paper with facts, apart from opinions. To accumulate genuine facts and to assign to each of them exactly its rightful weight seems to be one royal highway towards the attainment of truth in doctrine also. The primary facts on the subject of the supper must be gained by asking, What did the Founder Himself do? and what did He say? and what is the legitimate meaning in the Scriptural recitals of the words used and of the acts done by Him?

A LETTER ADDRESSED TO THE REV. J. M. MORGAN,  
VICAR OF DALTON IN FURNESS, CHAIRMAN OF  
THE CLERICAL MEETING.

You will well remember, my dear Sir, that the above paper was read at your large clerical meeting, simply as touching an historical question, although the meeting almost of necessity diverged into the practical enquiry, as to the proper time or times in the day for the administration of "the Lord's supper." You will also I know bear in mind that, when the question of the favourableness of church authority to early morning communion had been discussed, I ventured in my reply to remind my brethren, that if we received the precedent of the early church as of binding authority on this particular, we must equally receive its authority as binding in respect of fasting communion. I also ventured to affirm that there is high probability that our Lord's example as to the time of communion was followed for a certain period in the earliest ages; and that just as we infer the existence of infant baptism during the silence on the subject that prevails, I think till the time of Tertullian, (at least I, for one, do not remember observing or hearing of any earlier mention of it), just so we may infer that our Lord's institution of the Lord's supper at even was followed during at least a considerable part of the same period, *i.e.* until Tertullian, during which time nothing is said upon the subject in the early fathers: and I believe I further ventured to say that if the subject came under real discussion many arguments in favour of evening communion would have to be brought forward, which had not yet been adduced. And lastly, I shall ever remember how you, in a short conversation that took place after the meeting was broken up, brought the question at once to its practical issue by asking "Now to what after all does this question come? What is the proper time for administering the Communion to our people?" And when the reply was made, "At any times that suit our people best, and that seem to be most for their spiritual benefit," you gave utterance to a strong concurrence in that opinion; and there the conversation closed. Perhaps nothing more would have been required, had not a pamphlet been put into my hand in my way to the meeting, in which I find a very different conviction; *viz.* that from the very first, *by a kind of general*

*Christian instinct*, the morning, and the early morning, was fixed upon, as the only proper time for communion; and that in all probability there was no breach of this custom, except the once-a-year celebration on Maundy Thursday, which Augustine so much favours in his letter to Januarius, No. 118. It is perfectly true that my paper had proved that evening communions were in existence to a certain considerable extent in the two centuries to which it refers: but I have deemed it desirable to add a few remarks in reply to that writer. I should probably have published this letter and paper at once, but I was preparing the present long-promised work of greater dimensions upon this sacrament, with ample citations from the fathers and from later writers also, and it would have been very undesirable to forestall it.

In addition, however, to the cases which I have mentioned in the third and fourth centuries, I ought perhaps to call your attention both to those of the second century and to some few instances later than the fourth.

In the second century several striking instances are to be found in Tertullian.

First in the *Apologeticus* p. 8 of my folio edition, Paris, 1634, allusion is made to the silly and groundless scandals of Christians eating a child and committing other enormities. We have only to notice (1) that both these charges are referable to mistaken accounts of their eating Christ's flesh in a blessed and holy communion: and then (2) we may observe that the crimes laid to their charge are said to be committed after overthrowing the lamps. This passage furnishes us with some evidence in favour of the Holy Communion having been held at evening.

In the *De Corona* p. 121 I find as follows: "The sacrament of the eucharist was both held during the time of food, and was enjoined on "all by the Lord, even at the assemblies before morning light, and we "do not take it from the hands of any but the presiding clergymen."

In Tertullian's *Address to a Wife*, p. 189, he mentions "nightly convocations," and objects that no husband "would endure his wife's spending "the night away from him in the solemnities of the passover" (meaning the Lord's supper); and in the next sentence occur the words "that "feast of the Lord."

As to the other writers of the First and Second Centuries than Tertullian, I have not found any mention of the time of the Lord's supper in Justin or Irenæus or Clement of Alexandria or Hippolytus, or in the briefer authors of that or of the First Century. But I may as well notice Pliny writing to Trajan in the First Century about the Christians assembling before daylight and singing an antiphonal, singing hymns to Christ as to God, and *binding themselves by an oath* to lead a



moral life in many specified particulars. But who would have thought of the writer of that pamphlet making this an argument for early communion by rendering "sese sacramento obstringere," *binding themselves by the sacrament* not to do evil? I need not ask you to remember that Trajan knew the word sacramentum very well in two senses: (1) as the military oath that bound the soldier to himself, and (2) as the deposit at the commencement of a lawsuit: but that he would guess the Christian sacrament to be in the term, without any turn of speech to lead him to it, not I alone but all the other writers I have seen have not an idea.

It might be thought very reasonable to go no further in the enquiry than A. D. 420, which is about the date at which we may suppose Hermias Sozomen as aforesaid, to have written about Egypt: for this date carries us on for three centuries and a half after the confirmation of the position of Christianity in the world by the casting down to the ground of its great rival and one of the two chief persecutors of Christians, the Jewish power. If evening communion, which is (at least probably) the only one mentioned in Holy Writ, endured in vast regions for 350 years after Jerusalem perished, that is surely enough to secure for it (1) the highest sanction, viz. that of Scripture, and (2) some free tolerance in the primitive ages. But again, instead of there being no trace (as has been mistakenly asserted) of evening communion for the last 1600 years, we have to strike off a century and a half from that reckoning, and to say "You should at least have put 1450 instead of 1600." But the statement is a wild one at this end also; for we surely had some traces of evening communion in the most recent periods since the Reformation, though we may not be yet prepared to say either at what century evening communion wholly ceased, nor at what date it was recommenced.

It may, however, not be without interest just to set down traces of it in accredited writings for a century or two after A. D. 420.

In Basil of Seleucus (Vol. 85 Migne's Ed. of the Greek fathers, p. 596) is found a very remarkable description of an enormous crowd assembling to keep the day of St Thecla. Of the communion in this festival it is enough to say that it bears no sign of having been celebrated at early morning, nor in fasting. On the contrary it is administered and partaken of by the crowd, with more eagerness than reverence, at the close of the festival, apparently in the afternoon before returning to their several homes. This Basil is placed in the middle of the fifth century—thirty years after the date we have given to Sozomen's account of the Evening Communion in the Thebaid or northern Egypt.

Isidore of Seville is one of the pillars of this history of church ritual. We may place the centre of his life at the meeting-point of the fifth or

sixth centuries. He writes thus, in his *Origines* p. 80 of the Paris edition of 1601: "It has been called the Lord's supper because on that day the Saviour sacrificed the passover with His own disciples; which [passover, *i.e.* the Lord's supper] also up to this day is celebrated, as has been handed down, and a holy chrism (*i.e.* for confirmation) is made in it." Then p. 271 "It is called a supper from the eaters sharing it in common," &c., &c.: and he adds "but the supper is an evening meal which the ancients used to call *vespertina*." He does not add: "but we celebrate only in the morning," nor does he say a word for or against evening communion. He only adds "In usu enim non erant prandia. People then did not dine, as we do."

In the Commentary of Eucherius, Bishop of Lyons, who died in the year 464, we find remarks on 1 Cor. xi. 22 which strengthen the statements of Socrates and Sozomen regarding evening communion in Egypt. "There was a time, as some assert, when a bad custom had prevailed among the Corinthians, to disgrace the churches everywhere by banquets, in which they ate before the Lord's oblation, and thus they postponed this (sacrament) to night time by prolonging the feast: and while the rich were coming to the eucharist in a state of intoxication, the poor were being tortured with hunger. But that custom, as the narrative goes, came down to that day from Gentile superstition. And from this also in some places through the rural regions of Egypt, or Syria, it is said that they assemble at the church by night after supper on Saturday." Eucherius is to be found in Migne's Vol. II. of Cassian; and this passage is at p. 805.

Besides this, a Sedulius—either he whose name stands in a council at Rome A.D. 721, or another whose name marks the year 818 (see Migne's notice of him)—in commenting on the same passage, p. 151, recites the above piece of Eucherius without acknowledgment.

Two hundred years later John, Bishop of Avranches, and afterwards of Rouen, who died in 1078, orders the celebration of the mass at the third hour (9 A.M.), at the sixth hour (noon), which he calls the common custom, and at the ninth hour (3 o'clock) which he calls the time of fasting: and he ends by giving licence for "sacrificing the mass" earlier than the third or later than the ninth hour; see p. 97 Migne's Edition, Vol. 247, Latin Fathers.

But to return to the eighth century, Bishop Theodulf of Orleans sat in the Frankfurt council of 794, which Charlemagne called to put down Adoptionism. One of his laws, p. 204, Migne, prescribes that "the fast must not be broken before the evening office." There can be little room for doubting that this fasting had reference to the reception of the Mass at the Evening Prayers.

We thus find scattered notices of evening communion much later than A.D. 430 (1450 years ago): and we may therefore take upon us to demur to the hastily made assertion, that the administration of the Lord's supper in the evening appears either not to have been practised after the time of the apostles or to have ceased at an early date in the subsequent history of Christianity.

We should like to know more on this subject.

I notice in Photius a natural disposition to restrict the term the Lord's supper—*Κυριακὸν δεῖπνον*—to the annual special celebration of it on Maundy Thursday, which shews that this one annual evening communion survived in his diocese; but I find no other notice of it in his writings. Doubtless much that we should like to know lies beneath the waves of a pitiless oblivion: and this makes every discovery precious. But let us not complain. There is a Providence, and we have enough, if we will but patiently work and bring latent truth to light. Things are hidden for men to find.

There was a great celebration of the newly reformed rite of the Lord's supper at Zurich on Maunday Thursday. I wonder whether it took place in the evening.

CHARLES HEBERT.

AMBLESIDE, *December 5, 1878.*

# INDICES.

---

- I. EVERY FATHER AND WRITER FROM WHOM CITATIONS ARE MADE.
- II. VERY MANY OF THE DOCTRINAL STATEMENTS AND OF THE TERMS USED.
- III. EVENTS OF HISTORY AND OTHER FACTS MENTIONED.
- IV. PASSAGES OF HOLY WRIT COMMENTED UPON IN THE CITATIONS.



# INDICES.

THE four following indices are set at the end of this volume for convenience of reference. The appendices, which are put before them, are hardly regarded as an integral part of the work, and are not embraced in the indices.

## FIRST INDEX. WRITERS CITED.

- Abbot, B. of Salisbury, Cent. xvi. Vol. ii.  
pp. 450—452  
Abelard, xii. ii. 99—102  
Ægyptius, vi. i. 520, 521  
Ælfric, x. ii. 1—5  
Æneas Sylvius, xv. ii. 243—246  
Agobard of Lyons, ix. i. 581—586  
Alan of Lille, xii. ii. 118—123  
Albert the Great, xiii. ii. 155—159  
Albertin, xvii. ii. 542—545  
Alcuin, viii. i. 563—568  
Algerus of Liege, xi. ii. 58  
Amalaricus of Treves, viii. i. 577—579  
Ambrose, iv. i. 236—248  
Ambrose, Isaac, xvii. ii. 618—622  
Ammonius, vi. i. 517—520  
Amphilochius, iv. i. 323—325  
Anastasius, vi. i. 501—508  
Andreas of Crete, vii. i. 541—543  
Andrewes, xvi. ii. 470—473  
Anselm, xi. ii. 42—51  
Apollinaris, iv. i. 367, 368  
Aponius, vii. i. 544  
Aquinas, Thomas, xiii. ii. 159—164  
Arminius, xvi. ii. 483—485  
Arnould, Antoine, xvii. ii. 562—571  
Arnoulds, The, of Port Royal, xvii. ii.  
571—575  
Ascham, xvi. ii. 343—347  
Athanasius, iv. i. 152—158  
Augustine, iv. i. 251—281  
Avitus, v. i. 429—480  
Bacon, Roger, xiii. ii. 144—146  
Barnabas, ii. i. 34—37  
Barrow, xvii. ii. 612, 613  
Basil the Great, iv. i. 190—201  
Basil of Seleucus, v. i. 463—465  
Baxter, xvii. ii. 652—654  
Becon, xvi. ii. 321, 322  
Bede, viii. i. 545—549  
Bellarmine, xvi. ii. 429—439  
Benedict, St, of Aniane, ix. i. 591—594  
Berengar, xi. ii. 21—31  
Bernard, St, xii. ii. 102—108  
Bertram, ix. i. 605—611  
Beveridge, xvii. ii. 628—631  
Beza, xvi. ii. 410—414  
Bonaventure, xiii. ii. 150—154  
Bossuet, xvii. ii. 592—599  
Bradford, xvi. ii. 368—370  
Bramhall, xvii. ii. 537—539  
Bridget's, St, life, v. i. 473, 474  
Bruno, Bishop of Segni, xi. ii. 79—82  
Bucer, xvi. ii. 378—386  
Bull, Bishop, xvii. ii. 615—618  
Bullinger, xvi. ii. 386—389  
Cæsarius, iv. i. 219—223  
Cajetan, xvi. ii. 420—426  
Calixtus, George, xvii. ii. 527—532  
Calvin, xvi. ii. 335—342  
Canons of Carthage, v. i. 469, 470  
Caprera, xvi. ii. 497, 498  
Cassian, iv. i. 348—352  
Chemnitz, xvi. ii. 415—420  
Chillingworth, xvii. ii. 548—550  
Chromatius, v. i. 439, 440  
Chrysologus, v. i. 457—462  
Chrysostom, iv. i. 331—348

- Claggett, xvii. ii. 635, 636  
 Clarkson, Daughter of, xvii. ii. 506, 507  
 Claude, John, xvii. ii. 601—604  
 Clement of Alexandria, ii. i. 59—66  
 Clement of Rome, i. i. 11—22  
 Clementines, The Pseudo, iii. i. 132—143  
 Colet, John, xv. ii. 269—273  
 Comber, xiii. ii. 636—638  
 Conservation, H. H., Theory of, xix. ii. 731, 732  
 Cornelius, iii. i. 123, 124  
 Cosin, xvii. ii. 539—542  
 Councils to 326, iv. i. 144—150  
 Coverdale, Myles, xv. ii. 257—259  
 Crakanthorp, xvi. ii. 498—502  
 Cranmer, xvi. ii. 322—327  
 Cudworth, xvii. ii. 554—558  
 Cyprian, iii. i. 114—123  
 Cyril of Alexandria, iv. i. 369—386  
 Cyril of Jerusalem, iv. i. 184—190  
  
 Damasus, iv. i. 312—314  
 Damian of Ostia, xi. ii. 10—14  
 De Cœna Domini, xii. ii. 131—135  
 Decree of Coun., The, Lateran IV., xii. ii. 136, 137  
 Denison, Archdeacon, xix. ii. 693—697  
 Didymus, iv. i. 281—283  
 Diognetus, Letter to, i. i. 31—33  
 Dionysius of Alexandria, iii. i. 129—132  
 Dionysius, Pseudo, vi. i. 490—495  
 Duns Scot, xiii. ii. 172—178  
 Durand of Laodicea, xi. ii. 54, 55  
 Durand of Mende, xiii. ii. 164—172  
 Durand de St Pourcain, xvi. ii. 273—280  
  
 Eckhart, Superintendent, xvii. ii. 560, 561  
 Ephraim Syrus, iv. i. 316—320  
 Epiphanius, iv. i. 296—303  
 Erastus, xvi. ii. 389—396  
 Eucherius of Lyons, v. i. 437—439  
 Eusebius of Alexandria, iv. i. 418—422  
 Eusebius of Cæsarea, iv. i. 159—169  
 Eusebius of Emesa, iv. i. 180—182  
 Eustathius, Liturgy of, iv. i. 182—184  
 Eutychius of Constantinople, vi. i. 499—501  
 Evagrius, vi. i. 514—516  
  
 Fabianus, iii. i. 106, 107  
 Facundus, vi. i. 483, 490  
 Felix, iv. i. 312—314  
 Fenelon, xvii. ii. 649—651  
 Fisher, Bishop, xvi. ii. 296—302  
 Fox, xvi. ii. 474—480  
 Francis of Assisi, xiii. ii. 137—143  
 F. of Sales, xvi. ii. 489—494  
 Frith, John, xv. ii. 252—257  
 Fulbert of Chartres, xi. ii. 31—35  
 Fulgentius of Ruspe, v. i. 480—487  
 Fulke, xvi. ii. 406—410  
  
 Gaudentius of Brescia, v. i. 423—425  
 Gelasius I., v. i. 474, 475  
 Gennadius, Dositheus, xv. ii. 233—236  
 Gerbert, x. ii. 5—9  
 Gerhard (Erasmus), xvi. ii. 281—289  
 Germanus of Constantinople, viii. i. 549—554  
 Germanus of Paris, vi. i. 495—499  
 Geroch of Reuchenspur, xii. ii. 108—111  
 Gerson, xiv. ii. 214—222  
 Geste, xvi. ii. 396—400  
 Goode, Dean, xix. ii. 695—701  
 Goulburn, Dean, xix. ii. 708—712  
 Gratian's Decree, xii. ii. 94—96  
 Gregory I., vi. i. 508—514  
 Gregory of Agrigentum, vi. i. 516, 517  
 Gregory of Nazianzum, iv. i. 209—219  
 Gregory of Nyssa, iv. i. 202—209  
 Gregory Thaumaturge, iii. i. 124, 125  
 Grindal, xvi. ii. 400, 401  
 Guibert, xii. ii. 85—90  
 Guion, Madame, xvii. ii. 599—601  
 Guitmund of Aversa, xi. ii. 55—58  
  
 Haag, Professor, xix. ii. 685—691  
 Haimo of Halberstadt, ix. i. 594, 595  
 Hales, Alexander of, xiii. ii. 146—149  
 Hall, xvii. ii. 519—523  
 Hammond, xvii. ii. 558, 559  
 Harrison, Dr, xix. ii. 701—703  
 Hausschein, xvi. ii. 371—378  
 Heber, Bishop, on J. T. xvii. ii. 578, 579  
 Henry VIII. of England, xvi. ii. 293—300  
 Hermas, ii. i. 37—41  
 Hervé of Dole, xii. ii. 91, 92  
 Hesychius, v. i. 440, 441  
 Hilary of Arles, v. i. 425, 427  
 Hilary the Deacon, iv. i. 249, 250  
 Hilary of Poitiers, iv. i. 169—180  
 Hildebert of Cluny, xii. ii. 96, 97  
 Hinkmar, ix. i. 627—629  
 Hippolytus, iii. i. 108—114  
 Hoadley, xviii. ii. 675—678  
 Honius, see Ullm.  
 Honorius of Autun, xii. ii. 97—99  
 Hooker, xvi. ii. 452, 453  
 Hooper, xvi. ii. 358, 359  
 Hospinian, xvi. ii. 439—443  
 Hugo de St Victor, xii. ii. 92—94  
 Humbert of Rheims, xi. ii. 35—38  
 Huss, xiv. ii. 203—212  
 Hutchinson, xvi. ii. 370  
  
 Ignatius, i. i. 23—30  
 Ildephonsus, ix. i. 638, 639  
 Innocent III., xii. ii. 123—131  
 Irenæus, ii. i. 50—58  
 Isaac of Syria, v. i. 462, 463  
 Isaiah, Abbot, v. i. 470—473  
 Isidore of Pelusium, v. i. 453—457

- Isidore of Seville, vii. i. 522—530  
 Isidorian Decretals, Pseudo, ix. i. 586—591  
 Ivo of Chartres, xi. ii. 52—64
- Jacob, Dr, xix. ii. 721, 722  
 Jansen of Ghent, xvi. ii. 352—355  
 Jansen of Ypres, xvii. ii. 523—527  
 Jerome, iv. i. 283—296  
 Jerome of Prague, xiv. ii. 212—214  
 Jewel, xvi. ii. 348—352  
 John of Avranches, xi. ii. 38—42  
 John of Damascus, viii. i. 554—563  
 John of Paris, xiii. ii. 180—183  
 John Scot Erigena, ix. i. 600—605  
 Johnson, xvii. ii. 662, 663  
 Julian, ix. i. 639—659  
 Justin Martyr, ii. i. 41—48  
 Justini Spuria, iv. i. 150, 151
- Kempis, Thomas à, xiv. ii. 222—228  
 Ken, xvii. ii. 631—633  
 Knox and the Ch. of England, xvi. ii. 327, 328
- Lactantius, iii. i. 127—129  
 Lanfranc, xi. ii. 14—20  
 Lange's Bibelwerk, xix. ii. 712, 713  
 Lapide, C. à, xvi. ii. 485—489  
 Latimer, xvi. ii. 316—321  
 Lawrence of Novara, vii. i. 531  
 Leibnitz, Posth. Works, xvii. ii. 638—649  
 Leo the Great, v. i. 465—469  
 Liddon, Canon, and M. Capel, xix. ii. 732—736  
 Lightfoot, xvii. ii. 550—553  
 Limborch, xvii. ii. 624, 628  
 Liturgy of Cyril, iv. i. 386, 387  
 Lubke, Professor, xix. ii. 691, 692  
 Luther, Martin, xvi. ii. 290—296  
 Lyra, De, xiv. ii. 188—191
- Macarius of Egypt, iv. i. 320—323  
 Macarius Magnes, iii. i. 126, 127  
 Maldonat, xvi. ii. 426—429  
 Marius Mercator, v. i. 443—445  
 Mark the Eremite, iv. i. 365, 366  
 Marriott, R. W., xix. ii. 723, 724  
 Marsilius of Padua, xiii. ii. 183—187  
 Martin's life, by Sulp. Severus, v. i. 314, 315  
 Maternus, iv. i. 362, 363  
 Maximus of Constantinople, vii. i. 531—537  
 Maximus of Turin, v. i. 445, 446  
 Mede, xvii. ii. 532—537  
 Melancthon, xvi. ii. 302—310  
 Methodius, iv. i. 151, 152  
 Moehler, Professor, xix. ii. 682—685  
 Montanus, ix. i. 636—638  
 More, Dr Henry, xvii. ii. 580—583  
 More, Sir Thomas, xv. ii. 253—255
- Morton, xvi. ii. 480—483  
 Moschus of Jerusalem, vii. i. 537, 538  
 Musculus, Wolfgang, xvi. ii. 355—358
- Nestorius, iv. i. 387—394  
 Nicephorus, viii. i. 569—572  
 Nicephorus Blemmidas, xiii. ii. 178, 179  
 Nicephorus Xanthopulus, xiv. ii. 199, 200  
 Nicetas of Aquileia, v. i. 474  
 Nicetas of Colossæ, xiii. ii. 154—185  
 Nicolas I., ix. i. 625—627  
 Nilus, v. i. 446—450  
 Norwich Tract, xix. ii. 730, 731
- Ockham, xiv. ii. 192—194  
 Origen, iii. i. 83—104  
 Ortizius, Blazius, ix. i. 640—642  
 Outram, xvii. ii. 589—592  
 Owen, xvii. ii. 583—587
- Pacian, iv. i. 315, 316  
 Palladius, iv. i. 325—330  
 Palmer, W., xix. ii. 681, 682  
 Pareus, xvi. ii. 444—450  
 Parker, xvi. ii. 359, 360  
 Paschasius, ix. i. 595—599  
 Paulinus of Aquileia, viii. i. 568  
 Paulinus of Nola, iv. i. 363—365  
 Pelagius, iv. i. 227—236  
 Peter of Blois, xii. ii. 83—85  
 Peter Lombard, xii. ii. 113—118  
 Peter Martyr, xvi. ii. 360—368  
 Peter the Singer, xii. ii. 111—113  
 Philo of Carpastum, iv. i. 414—417  
 Photius, ix. i. 630—635  
 Pilkington, xvi. ii. 405, 406  
 Platon of Moscow, xviii. ii. 655, 666  
 Poloni, Frates, xvii. ii. 663, 664  
 Pontianus, iii. i. 105, 106  
 Pontifical of Clement and Urban, xviii. ii. 666, 667  
 Proclus, v. i. 432—437  
 Procopius of Gaza, v. i. 487—488  
 Prosper of Aquitaine, v. i. 450—453  
 Prudentius, iv. i. 248, 249
- Quesnel, xvii. ii. 622—624
- Rabanus Maurus, ix. i. 612—620  
 Rabbulas, v. i. 442, 443  
 Rainolds, xvi. ii. 462—470  
 Remigius, ix. i. 629, 630  
 Retrospective Thoughts, ix. i. 623, 624  
 Reynolds of Norwich, xvii. ii. 545—548  
 Ricaut, Paul, xviii. ii. 667, 668  
 Ridley, xvi. ii. 328—335  
 Rufinus, iv. i. 223—226  
 Rupert of Deutz, xi. ii. 67—77
- Sacramental Liturgies, iv. i. 352—362  
 Sandys, xvi. ii. 401—403  
 Saravia, xvi. ii. 454—482



- Savonarola, xv. ii. 259—269  
 Scudamore, W. H., xix. ii. 724—729  
 Seymour, Hobart, xix. ii. 718—720  
 Sicilian Paschal Chronicles, vii. i. 538, 539  
 Siricius, iv. i. 312—314  
 Smith, Henry, xvi. ii. 473, 474  
 Socrates, v. i. 427—430  
 Sophronius of Damascus, vii. i. 540, 541  
 Sozomen, v. i. 430—432  
 St Stephen, Cistercian, xi. ii. 77—79  
 Stillington, xvii. ii. 604—612  
 Summary observations, xix. ii. 736, 737  
 Sylvanus, John, of Jerusalem, iv. i. 303—312  
  
 Tauler, xiv. ii. 195—199  
 Taylor, Jeremy, xvii. ii. 575—580  
 Tertiaries, The, xiii. ii. 143, 144  
 Tertullian, ii. i. 67—82  
 Theodore of Heraclea, iv. i. 422  
 Theodore of Mopsuestia, iv. i. 394—401  
 Theodoret, iv. i. 401—414  
 Theodotus of Byzantium, ii. i. 66, 67  
 Theodotus of Studium, viii. i. 573—577  
 Theodulf of Orleans, ix. i. 580, 581  
 Theophilus of Alexandria, iv. i. 368, 369  
 Theophilus of Antioch, ii. i. 48—50  
 Theophylact, xi. ii. 69—67  
 Thiers, J. B., xviii. ii. 668, 669  
  
 Thirlwall, Bishop, xix. ii. 703—707  
 Thorndike, xvii. ii. 503—506  
 Tillotson, xvii. ii. 613—615  
 Tostatus of Avila, xv. ii. 229—232  
 Turretin, xvii. ii. 587—589  
 Turton, Bishop, xix. ii. 679—681  
 Tyndall, William, xv. ii. 246—252  
  
 Ullmann, Reformers before the Ref. xv. ii. 236—243  
 Usher, xvii. ii. 507—519  
  
 Victor of Antioch, v. i. 441, 442  
 Victorinus, Marius, iv. i. 366, 367  
 Vogan, Dr, xix. ii. 714—718  
  
 Wake, xvii. ii. 654—660  
 Walafrid Strabo, ix. i. 620—623  
 Valeran of Nuremberg, xi. ii. 51, 52  
 Waterland, xviii. ii. 670—675  
 Wetzer and Welte, xix. ii. 692—694  
 Whitaker, xvi. ii. 443, 444  
 Whitby, xvii. ii. 634, 635  
 Whitgift, xvi. ii. 403—405  
 Wilberforce, Archdeacon, xix. ii. 695, 696  
 Willett, xvi. ii. 494—497  
 Wilson, Bishop, xvii. ii. 660—662  
 Wycliff, xiv. ii. 200—203  
  
 Zeno of Verona, iv. i. 417, 418  
 Zwingel, xvi. ii. 310—316

## SECOND INDEX. DOCTRINE.

---

The leading principle in this index is to range the principal statements of doctrine according to the leading word in each, whether that word be at the beginning of the sentence or not. The object is to bring as many as possible of similar terms and statements near together, without presenting sentences or clauses in a broken form. The same purpose is carried out in some cases by ranging compound words by their root and not by the prefix, whether it be adverb or noun: e.g. ζωοθυρεῖ is set with θύω θύσιμον, &c., and ἀνυποί with ὑψωμα, &c. Also, English, Greek and Latin terms and statements, whose leading words have the same initial letters, are combined under those letters. In many instances there cannot be a doubt which is the leading word, as when such words occur as "sacrament," "body," "flesh," "blood," "substance," "accidents," "supper," "sacrifice," &c., by the Greek and Latin terms for these. It is hoped that by these arrangements the second, third and fourth indexes will make it almost as easy to find any important statement, event, &c., as it is by means of the first index and the tables of contents to find what opinions each writer maintained.

---

### A. a.

Entire Christ, with all accidents, except in so far as into Heaven, ii. 437, Bell.  
 Breaking, not an accident of a body now in glory, ii. 517, Usher  
 The most heresy, accident without subject, ii. 202, Wyo.  
 Say they eat, &c., but under covert of the accident, of bread and wine, ii. 635, Whit.  
 Breaking, &c., impossible to essence, possible to accidents, ii. 50, Anselm  
 May be accident of bread, and Christ's substance under, ii. 647, Leib.  
 Adoration of Church of Rome not necessarily idolatry. What intention? ii. 503, Thorn.  
 Does God wish us to adore it? Will our invention please Him? ii. 345, Asch.

### A. a.

May be adored by a good Christian, ii. 503, Thorn.  
 The subj. of an affirm. prop. agrees with predicate, ii. 437  
 Cross alone answers to altar, ii. 677, Hoad.  
 On the altar of the cross, ii. 529, Calixt.  
 Even heathens eat on tables, not on altars, ii. 555, Cudw.  
 Never failed to approach holy altar, ii. 632, Ken  
 Sacram. of Christ's altar made by power of the words, ii. 140, 141, F. of A.  
 The table expressly called an altar by Ignatius, i. 29  
 On the altar it exists in own appearance—imperceptible, ii. 97, Hild. V.

## A. a.

We adore Him on the altar as sages did in manger, ii. 408, Fulke  
 Three altars temp. Sol., so Christian, ii. 119, Alan.  
 Gift (loaves changed into, &c.) greater than altar, Matt. xxiii. 2, ii. 63, Theophylact  
 Three effusions, (1) on altar, (2) on cross, (3) in heart, ii. 624, Quesn.  
 To alter arrangement of parts fatal, ii. 731, H. H.  
 The American P. B. omits words in the Scotch, ii. 729  
 Do angels and Mary and saints attend? ii. 220, Gers.  
 Patristic, therefore Anglican! ii. 735, Lidd.  
 As far as one thing can be another, ii. 716, Vogan  
 Ap. Can. 85 draws in all Ap. Const., i. 140  
 As to appearances of Christ after ascension, ii. 110, Ger.  
 Then the minister applies these blessings, ii. 662, Wilson  
 A condensed synopsis in reply to the two Archd., ii. 700  
 Athens the University, i. 220  
 Deficiency of exhibition of atonement in T. à K., ii. 222  
 ἀγάπη ποιεῖν, i. 28, Ignat.  
 τὰ ἅγια καὶ τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων, i. 149  
 τῆς νοτίδος ἀγλαῆς αἰσθητήρια, i. 189, Cyr. J.  
 ἁγιασμάτων τῶν Θεῶν, i. 131, Dion.  
 μετὰ ἀδείας ἀπολαύση πολλῆς, κ.τ.λ., i. 333, Chrys.  
 ἀειπαρόντων καθάρὰ καὶ ὁμόμνητα αἵματα, i. 560, J. of D.  
 πάντας φοινισσομένους αἵματι, i. 335, Chrysost.  
 ῥανίδες αἵματος ὀλίγαι κοσμοὺν ὄλον ἀναπλάττουσαι, i. 215, Greg. Na.  
 προκοινωνῶν ἐν τῇ αἰρέσει...αἰρετικὸς ὁ ἄρτος, i. 576, Theod. Stu.  
 τὸ αἶμα τὸ ἀναγέννησάν σε, i. 340, Chrysost.  
 τῷ ἀνωτάτῳ πέπλῳ (τῷ ἄερϊ) τὰ δῶρα ἐπικαλύπτει, i. 575, Theod. Stu.  
 ἀληθινὸν καὶ ἀθάνατον ἄρτον γεύμεθα, i. 563, J. of D.  
 ἀληθῶς, John vi., i. 178  
 κατ' ἀληθείαν αἶμα καὶ σῶμα, οὐ τύπος, i. 126, Mac.  
 ἀληθῶς μὲν βρώσις ἡ πρᾶξις κ.τ.λ., i. 98, Origen  
 ὁ μὴ πιστεύων Αὐτὸν ἀληθινόν, ἐκπίπτει, i. 301, Epiph.  
 τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν λύσαντας, i. 139, Ps. Clem.  
 μελλίεται καὶ διαμερίζεται ὁ Ἄμνος Θεοῦ, i. 361, Duc.  
 τοῦ Ἄμμου τοῦ Θεοῦ σφαγιαζομένου, i. 507, Anast. S.

## A. a.

ἡμῶν δὲ ὁ ἄμνος βρωθήσεται πρὸς ἐσπέραν, i. 214, Greg. Na.  
 μῆδεις τῶν ἀμνήτων, i. 136, Ps. Clem.  
 δι' ὕδατος ἀναγεννήσαντας, i. 139, Ps. Clem.  
 ἐν αὐτῷ ἀνακίρναται (John vi. He that eateth), i. 368, Apoll.  
 ἀνάμνησις, what it is, ii. 672, Waterl.  
 ἀναπτύσσει πάντα τὸν τῆς εὐεργεσίας τοῦ Θεοῦ θησαυρὸν, i. 562, J. of D.  
 τοῦ μὴ γενέσθαι ἀναφορὰν παρόντων αἰρετικῶν, i. 635, Phot.  
 τὴν Θεῶν ἀναφορὰν, i. 136, Ps. Clem.  
 τῆς ἁγίας ἀναφορᾶς καὶ κοινωνίας, i. 635, Phot.  
 τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀνθρακος...Is. vi.  
 οὐδὲ ἀνθρωπίνης φύσεως κατορθώματα τὰ προκείμενα, i. 339, Chrysost.  
 συναποθεωθῇ τὸ ἀνθρωπινόν, i. 207, Greg. Ny.  
 ἀντίτυπος representative, i. 22, Pseudo-Clem. R.  
 τοῖς ἀντίτυποις ἐπιτιθέμενον, i. 500, Eutych. Cons.  
 ἀντίτυπα ταῦτα ἐπιτελούμεν, i. 136, Ps. Clem.  
 τούτων τῶν ἀντίτυπων, i. 57, Iren.  
 ἀντίδοτος τοῦ μὴ θανεῖν, i. 26, Ignat.  
 μεθαμῶς πρὸ τῆς ἀπολύσεως ἐξερχόμενος, i. 420, Euseb. Alex.  
 ἀπομνημονεύμασι, i. 43, Just.  
 Ἀρειομανίται, i. 152, Ath.  
 τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως προσφέροντες, i. 162, Euseb. C.  
 ἄρτον ζωῆς ὅς ἐστι σὰρξ, i. 26, I. X., i. 26, Ignat.  
 νικήσῃ τὸν θάνατον ἢ τροφῇ τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς ζωῆς, i. 534, Max.  
 οὐ κοινὸν ἄρτον, κ.τ.λ., i. 43, Just. and i. 53, Iren.  
 ἄρτος ἐπιδέχεται τὸν λόγον, κ.τ.λ., i. 54, Iren.  
 ὅλου ἄρτου, τῆς εὐλογίας καὶ τῆς προσφορᾶς, i. 553, Germ. Con.  
 μακαριότητος ἄρτος, i. 157, Ath.  
 μέλισσον τὸν ἅγιον ἄρτον, i. 361, Duc.  
 ἄρτον σῶμα ἀδιστάκτως, i. 456, Isid. Pel.  
 τοῦ ἄρτου...δν...ποιεῖν, κ.τ.λ., i. 45, Just.  
 οὐκ ἐστὶ φύσει ὁ ἄρτος σῶμα ἀλλ' ἀντίτυπον, i. 329, Pallad.  
 ἀποφῆνῃ τὸν ἄρτον σῶμα, i. 136, Ps. Clem.  
 ἄρτον οὐράνιον, i. 26, Ignat., see i. 66, Theodot. B.  
 τὸν ἄρτον τῆς εὐλογίας, &c., i. 97, Orig.  
 μετὰ τὸ ἁγιασθῆναι ἀνυψοῖ τὸν ἄρτον, i. 507, Anast. S.  
 ἴσχυς ἄρτου (Isaiah iii.), i. 163, Euseb. C.  
 βρώσῃ τὸν ζῶντα ἄρτον, i. 200, Bas.  
 ἀρχιερεὺς, ἱερεὺς, λευίτης and λαϊκός, i. 16, Clem. R.

A. α.

*τῶν ἀρχιερέων τὸν σύλλογον τὸν πολὺν*,  
i. 45, Bas. Sel.  
*οὐ ἀσκήται*, i. 136, Ps. Clem.  
*τῆς ἀφέσεως τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν τύχῳσιν, κ.τ.λ.*,  
i. 57, Iren.  
*ἀφέσεως ἁμαρτιῶν οὕτω καταξιούμεθα*, i.  
326, Pallad.  
*τῷ φθαρτῷ τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν*, i. 55, Iren.  
*ἀφθαρσία*, i. 66, Clem. A.  
Manifestos abusus suaviter riserunt, ii.  
358, Melanc.  
Duas substantias iisdem accidentibus in  
uno loco, ii. 447, Pareus  
Nihil de substantiâ remanet...acciden-  
talia, ii. 120, Alan.  
De altari accipiunt et moriuntur, i. 275,  
Aug.  
Virtus instrumentalis...movetur ab a-  
gente principali, ii. 163, T. Aquin.  
Agnus Dei immolamus, i. 462, Chrysol.  
Ad altare Dei in communione, i. 270,  
Aug.  
Ascendere ad altare Dei, i. 39, Hermas  
In altari Dei sacramenta benedicit, i.  
295, Jer.  
Altare in celis, i. 53, Iren.  
In altari crucis, ascribed to S. Andrew,  
ii. 536, Mede  
Altare Dei est Filius Dei, i. 226, Ruf.  
Illi participes Divini altaris, isti dæ-  
moniorum, i. 229, Pel.  
In centro cameræ super altare, Ejus  
figuram, i. 625, P. Nic.  
Altare metnendum, i. 316, Pac.  
Sancti altaris oblatio, i. 256, Aug.  
In sextâ feriâ altari subtrahatur orna-  
tus, sabbato reponatur, i. 593, Ben. An.  
Ad altare offerentem Seipsum, i. 567,  
Alcuinus  
Sub altare animæ...super altare corpus  
Domini, i. 286, Aug.  
Altare sanctum, in quo Deo vota, &c., i.  
626, P. Nic. I.  
Altaris palla, incendio dentur, i. 589,  
Ps.-Is. D.  
Eversores luminum, i. 79, Tert., also  
etiam antelucanis cœtibus  
Antistites, velut advocati, i. 256 and 257,  
Aug.  
Ad aram Dei steteris, i. 68, Tert., i. 80  
and 81  
Altitudinem spiritualis sensûs non va-  
lent ascendere, i. 601, Scot.

B. β.

Question, Why after baptism remission  
in Lord's supper wanted, i. 616, Rab.  
Delay of baptism, i. 231, Amb.  
Not bare, of no force; full, not void and  
empty, ii. 389, Bullin.

B. β.

Ye will have nothing but Scripture.—As  
Christ left it bare, ii. 478, H. S.  
The bark of the letter, Christ's meaning  
within, ii. 254, Frith  
Benediction made to mean thanksgiving,  
ii. 424, Cajetan  
The word "benefits" in the rubric on  
kneeling, ii. 705, Thirl.  
To bind and to loose explained in Russia,  
ii. 665  
Change of Ritual in Sarum Manual for a  
bishop, ii. 729  
What not the meaning of "to bless,"  
ii. 388, Bullin.  
Idea of the shed blood being recovered,  
i. 555, J. of D.  
Not a drop of the blood lost, ii. 129, In-  
noc. III.  
The church knowing it Christ's own  
blood, all dreadful regard, ii. 407,  
Fulke, Rheim. N.  
Devil drew men to wine being blood as  
from side, ii. 629, Bet.  
The cup of blood is shed in each, not on  
cross, no cup there, ii. 439, Corn. & L.  
The water, 1 Cor. x., truly Christ's blood—  
ghostly, ii. 4, Ælf.  
Christ speaks of His dead body given to  
them to eat, ii. 715, 718, Vogan  
His ghostly body and blood, ii. 3, Ælf.  
Partaking of the substance of Christ's  
body and blood, ii. 340, Calv.  
The body and blood really exhibited and  
communicated to believers' souls, ii.  
585, Owen  
Puerile to think that the body enters our  
soul, ii. 377, Haus.  
That with the eye of faith we see the  
body there, i. 347, Chrys.  
If Christ's very body, &c. it were not a  
sacrament but a sacrifice, ii. 474, S.  
Christ's body circumscribed and bound  
to some set place, ii. 626, Limb.  
The body which the church's faith  
makes, &c. ii. 71, Rup.  
John Scot fain to shew that not truly  
Christ's body and blood, ii. 36, Bereng.  
His true body indeed in the soul, ii. 250,  
Frith  
Denied, not so much a body as a shadow  
and figure, ii. 55, Dur. of L. and 56  
Guitm.  
Extensibility of body, ii. 641, 2. Ans.  
But what if organic? ii. 642—4  
Cooperation, force, efficiency of body!  
Not coextensive with Deity, ii. 546,  
Reyn.  
In all fathers body and blood both clearly  
expressed, ii. 591, 2, Outr.  
Body of Christ not destroyed in such by  
being slain, ii. 531, Calixt.  
Two bodies of Christ, ii. 34, Fulb.

B.  $\beta$ .

Each particle Christ's whole body, ii. 58, Quesn.  
 We envelop the body as Nicodemus did, ii. 47, Anselm  
 Difficult, that true body given to faithful only in a raiful, ii. 562  
 Whether body in eucharist visible to glorified body, &c., &c., ii. 276, D. de St Pourcain  
 We eat His body, *i. e.* we surely believe, &c. ii. 251, Tynd.  
 Grace and glory enclosed in Christ's body and blood, ii. 619, I. Amb.  
 Obj. How can Christ's body be eaten by faith? ii. 700, Goode  
 Christ's body restoring our bodies and His blood our souls, ii. 49, Anselm  
 The true substantial body of Christ received and eaten, ii. 529, Calixt.  
 Body and blood both sacraments and res sacram., &c., ii. 116, P. Lomb.  
 Carry God in your body, ii. 34, Fulb.  
 Calls body and 'blood species! ii. 645, Leib.  
 A saving communication of very body and blood, ii. 272, Colet  
 The body and blood of Christ is received of every one, &c., ii. 329, Ridl.  
 The sacred covenant represents and conveys Christ's body, ii. 710, Goulb.  
 In this body sits in Heaven—thence not come till judgment, ii. 369, Bradf.  
 What is wrought inwardly by the said body and blood on the soul, ii. 398, Geste  
 Body and blood received by hand of faith with saving grace, ii. 512, Usher  
 Offers in His sacrament Christ's proper body and 'blood, &c., ii. 630, I. Amb.  
 The body not in sacrament according to its nature and mode of existence, ii. 705, Thirl.  
 Christ's natural body in the sacrament indeed, ii. 332, Ridl.  
 Denial of any such thing as His body corporally present even in believers, ii. 325, Cran.  
 But glorified body received—said to be present, ii. 673, Waterl.  
 A body can be in many places at once. No contradiction, ii. 436, Bellarm.  
 Denial that we eat the body with the mouth, ii. 334, Cran.  
 Only lively members eat the very body, ii. 327, Cran.  
 The very body consequently, &c., ii. 673, Waterl.  
 Our body transformed by it, as stronger, ii. 272, Colet  
 Heresy to trowe sacrament God's body and no bread, ii. 201, Wyc.

B.  $\beta$ .

How should body and blood of Christ be in the soul of a man? ii. 619, I. Amb.  
 Become the body, &c., the Divinity united to elements, ii. 617, 8, Bull  
 A body that is everywhere cannot move from place to place, ii. 626, Limb.  
 Denial Christ's body leave Heaven, or be in two places, ii. 656, Wake  
 Widow of Sarepta's jar of oil a type of Christ's body, ii. 18, Lanf.  
 To the faithful the real spiritual part of Christ's body, ii. 319, Hugh L.  
 Body living, God entire, true Man, ii. 44  
 Christ's body limited by properties of own nature, ii. 418, Chemn.  
 His body gives eternal life, ii. 25, Anselm  
 The bread is changed by these solemn words into Christ's body, ii. 50, Anselm  
 However small, body of Christ whole and entire, ii. 264, Sav.  
 Every man, good and evil, eateth the body, ii. 376, Cran.  
 Faith perceives under bread the true body, &c., ii. 649, Fenelon  
 This is My body, not a logical prop.—but a rhetorical, ii. 438  
 We are turned into the nature of the body and blood, ii. 370, Bradf.  
 He gave His body before He gave His blood, ii. 591, Outr.  
 Christ's true body and blood, sacramentally given and received by hypocrites, ii. 455, Sarav.  
 Exhibitives of Christ's body and blood retain own natures, ii. 397, Geste  
 Is "bread" virtue et effectu Christ's body? ii. 724  
 If bread were body and wine blood, separated, dead body, ii. 474, H. S.  
 Christ's body retains essential properties of man in Heaven, ii. 627, Limb.  
 Bread and wine are and are said to be the body and blood, ii. 363, P. Mart.  
 Denial that natural body, &c. are wherever Divine Person is, ii. 705, Thirl.  
 Christ's body finite and in Heaven and not to be adored, ii. 342  
 Not only with his body's mouth, but with heart, &c., ii. 17, Lanf.  
 Lanfranc says, the portion of the body is broken and eaten, ii. 25, Bereng.  
 Remembrance of an absent body broken, ii. 676, Hoad.  
 Jesus deigned to give us His body, &c., in truth, ii. 596, Boss.  
 Heavenly body in which the Word clothes self, ii. 686, Haag  
 Not that body and blood were or are separated, ii. 382, Buc.  
 A body not eat spiritually, nor soul corporally, ii. 474, H. S.

B. β.

The whole body in a thin wafer yet members distinct, ii. 519, Hall  
 With the body one receives the blood and Divinity all or none, ii. 599  
 Papists think taste very body of Christ corporeally, all abhor this, ii. 539, Cos.  
 Extreme parts of a body severed not according to place, ii. 550, Chill.  
 St Paul does not use the term "touch" the body of Christ, i. 459  
 So gross a conceit—"My body," My natural particular flesh, ii. 580, Dr More  
 His bodily absence necessary to rite, ii. 676, Hoad.  
 Such commemoration that body itself is present, ii. 529, Calixt.  
 Become in some ineffable way the body and blood, &c., ii. 697, A. Den.  
 Argument from qualities (*i. e.* substance and accident) of Christ's body being inseparable, ii. 610, Still.  
 We receive the body, &c., really (inwardly present), substantially, ii. 509, Usher  
 Not such a presence as repugnant to truth of body, ii. 411, Beza  
 Housel not the body which Christ suffered in, ii. 3, 4, Ælf.  
 Such a body could not penetrate doors, ii. 636, Whit.  
 Reverences to body and blood of Christ ought to be made, ii. 84, P. of B.  
 A Divine body belonging to eternal Logos, ii. 581, Dr More  
 The body, &c., by means of the invocation, ii. 662, Johnson  
 A body cannot be in any place without dimensions, ii. 610, Still.  
 "Gives (*præbere*) His own body," ii. 705, Thirl.  
 Body not human if in two places, ii. 365, P. Mart.  
 Our Lord proved His body to disciples by evidence of senses, ii. 577, J. Tay.  
 If turned substance of the body Christ really naturally, &c., ii. 322, Becon  
 Our adversaries declare that bread and wine are properly Christ's body and blood, ii. 362, P. Mart.  
 In substance bread, in mind and mystery Christ, ii. 359, Hoop.  
 To pluck from (it) the bread and wine maketh it no sacrament, ii. 322, Becon  
 Bread by Melch. an offering, ii. 85, P. of B.  
 Live not by bread alone—of transubstantiation, ii. 260 and Lord's P. 262, Sav.  
 Nothing but bread and wine to be received at altar, i. 359

B. β.

Form of bread, superstition in wafer bread feared, ii. 360, Parker  
 That a piece of bread can...become their God and Saviour, ii. 616, Bull  
 Acknowledge nothing but bread and wine, ii. 382, Buc.  
 Bread leavened, infants, warm water, &c. ii. 665, Platon  
 Scripture, reason and six centuries shew substantial bread and wine not changed, ii. 543, 4, Albertin  
 Bread (in all the church) transfused into one, ii. 33, Fulb.  
 The bread is the body, &c., ii. 716, Vogan  
 Bread broken, of whatever kind, ii. 625, Limb.  
 Beyond controversy, bread and wine are figures, not of any substance, ii. 342, Calv.  
 Not to reserve till (the bread) be so much as hoary, ii. 3, Ælf.  
 He changes the bread and wine until, &c., as soon as the priest speaks the words, 549, Fenelon  
 Material bread—false and heresy, ii. 148, A. Hales  
 What took He but bread? What brake He, &c.? What He brake He gave, ii. 477, J. Fox  
 Bread not depart from the sacrament, ii. 30, Bereng.  
 Bread becoming Christ's flesh, ii. 58, Alger  
 Unfermented bread He blessed, ii. 45, Anselm  
 Bread not taken away by corruption of subject, ii. 28, Bereng.  
 True Deity in bread and wine, ii. 69, Rup.  
 The sacrament His flesh covered under form of bread, ii. 18, Lanf.  
 This is the bread of affliction our fathers ate in Egypt, ii. 559, Hamm.  
 Bread and wine in quality changed to be true symbols, &c., ii. 413, Beza  
 In appearance bread and wine in truth the Lamb of God, ii. 69—76, Rup.  
 Bread cannot be other than significatively, ii. 630, Bev.  
 Bread or body must be expounded typically, ii. 576, J. Taylor  
 As if Christ's flesh were in the bread, ii. 375, Haus.  
 He knew well it was hallowed bread and not the Lord's body, ii. 476  
 Hints needed that he meant bread changed in figurative sense, ii. 352, Jewel  
 Breaking bread not description of this sacrament, ii. 288, Eras.  
 If no change, then of bread Christ said, This is, &c., ii. 435, Bell.

## B. β.

Bread doth not only represent but bring into us, &c., ii. 258, Cov.  
 Christ took bread and left it bread. The priest, &c., ii. 400, Grind.  
 Alternative of the bread becoming corrupt, i. 502, Anast. S.  
 Hearts of Jews and Mahomedans against image and bread worship, ii. 618, Bull  
 The bread has ceased to be bread, ii. 735, Lidd.  
 "Bread into His flesh is turned," quoted by M. Capel, ii. 734  
 Breaking the bread, *spontaneam passionem*, i. 623, Strab.  
 The bread out of which we make the flesh itself, ii. 46, Anselm  
 Simonites held it simply bread and wine, ii. 14, Damian  
 Natural substance of Christ "not here" in bread, ii. 329, Ridley  
 No reason that Melchizedek offered only bread and wine, ii. 590, Outr.  
 "Bread itself and wine transmuted," &c., ii. 706, Thirl.  
 Bread remaineth, is His body given to us, ii. 329, Ridl.  
 Bread still (1 Cor. x. 16) as assuredly receiveth Christ's body, ii. 534, Mede  
 Breaks into three parts, ii. 128  
 The words to be uttered in one breath, ii. 732, H. H.  
 Greeks buried remainder, ii. 37, Humb.  
*βαρὺν ἐρωλῆσε* (as if *ὑδωρ ἐρωλῆσε' ἐνθὲν βαρὺν ποδὶ*), i. 151, Spurr. Justini  
*Vilium bestiolarum dentes*, ii. 90, Guib.  
*Buccella Dominica venenum Judæ*, i. 275 (Aug.), 279

## C. γ.

Meaning of candles threefold, ii. 48, Anselm  
 Canon that those that leave church before communicating *ἀπορίσθαι*, i. 634, Phot.  
 Service easily carnal, i. 508, Greg. I.  
 Only the soul's food spiritual not carnal, ii. 147, A. Hales  
 Not carnal but spiritual manner only, ii. 630, Bev.  
 Carry self in own hands—bring to be eaten, &c., ii. 520, Hall  
 Canon Liddon builds on one sentence in the Catechism, ii. 733  
 Catalogues of great teachers and of heretics, i. 413, 414, Theod. Cyr.  
 Custom, laymen not in chancel at consecration, ii. 280, Eras.  
 Reformers denying bodily, admit no real change, ii. 579, B. Heber  
 Elements to be "really" changed is what Rome pleads for, ii. 579, B. Heber

## C. χ.

Fathers, and doctrine of change of substance, ii. 538  
 Not correct to say any change in their nature, ii. 578, B. Heber  
 Even sacramentarians allow a change in it, ii. 435, Bell.  
 Imagining some mysterious charm, &c., ii. 709  
 The church the living figure of Christ through all ages, ii. 683, Moehl.  
 Church of England clear. Unsteady minds vary in their conceits, ii. 522, Hall  
 Only clergy to eat what remains, i. 369, Theoph. A. and comments. Bals.  
 Cloth shaken and burnt, ii. 79, St Steph.  
 The four principal colours, &c., ii. 130, Innoc. III.  
 Joseph of Arim. a rebuke to unclean communicants, ii. 548, Reyn.  
 Unfit communicants, ii. 196, Taul.  
 The enemy does not hurt communicants, ii. 235, Cyr. L.  
 If full of love of world to communicate frequently, ii. 573  
 Bohemians demand daily communion and cup, ii. 204  
 Proper best times for communion, ii. 720, H. Seym.  
 True and substantial communion of flesh and blood, ii. 340, Calv.  
 On those that refuse communion from married elders, i. 635, Phot.  
 The instrument of a higher grace and a closer communion, &c., ii. 708, Goulb.  
 Communion to infants, one element suffices to save, ii. 423, Cajetan  
 Diverse times of communion, i. 260, Aug.  
 Devout adverse to frequent communion, ii. 708, Goulb.  
 Communion the delight God and His people have one in another, ii. 622, St Amb.  
 Rome desires frequent celebrations, not communions, ii. 720, H. Seym.  
 May be comprehended by higher beings, ii. 26, Bereng.  
 Concealing Himself under the covering, &c., ii. 707, Thirl.  
 Conclusion, no absolute virtue of itself, ii. 176, Duns  
 No truth in both the elements being under either kind, concomitance, ii. 647, Leib.  
 Confer on us sanctification, grace—how? ii. 682, Moehl.  
 The overthrow of the sacraments conferring grace, ii. 341, Calv.  
 Grace conferred as by instrument of Christ's passion, ii. 497, Caprera  
 Conferred by God through their means *ex op. op.*, ii. 682, Moehl.

## C. x.

If no priest, confess to brother, ii. 140, F. of A.  
 Confession given up, i. 432, Soz.  
 The real threefold cord is, Conf., Absol. and Bodily Pres., ii. 490  
 Man's version of confession before Lord's supper, i. 442, Vict. A.  
 As to confession before Lord's supper, ii. 611  
 What constitutes consecration, ii. 405, 6, Pilk.  
 Consecration to be set in Christ's whole action, ii. 587, Turretin  
 Jerome's saying, The life, not words, consecrates, ii. 42  
 Offer elements for consecration differs from sacrificing, ii. 675, Waterl.  
 Ingenious reasoning about validity of consecration, ii. 682, Palm.  
 The consecration an act of all present, ii. 12, 13, Damian  
 The giving must be by consecration, ii. 711, Goulb.  
 Words in prayer of consecration, partakers, &c., sacram. partic., ii. 682, Palm.  
 Irregular consecration of chrism, i. 638, Mont. Tol.  
 Is, after consecration, Christ's body ... life to faithful, ii. 28, Bereng.  
 Some think Christ consecrated twice ! ii. 349, Jewel  
 Ancient fathers teach, become and are by consecration the body and blood, ii. 617, Bull  
 Mr Scudamore's special pleading on our Prayer of Consecration, ii. 728  
 Hard to prove what the formula of consecration, ii. 288, Eras.  
 Consequences of belief that cannot be too often, ii. 718, H. Seym.  
 Constructional intermingling, &c., ii. 671, Waterl.  
 Consubstantiation the word for John of Paris; concomitance for Melancthon, ii. 183  
 Christ with us till the world's consummation, ii. 460, Sarav.  
 Given not to contact, but by contract, ii. 653, Baxt.  
 Divers opinions on the conversion, ii. 193, W. of O., (philosophical) 194  
 Converted into true flesh, &c., Ber.'s Recant., ii. 17, Lanf.  
 His sacred body should be conveyed to the faithful soul, ii. 546, Reyn.  
 An institution where Christ is conveyed to us, ii. 535, Mede  
 That sacraments, as pipes, convey, is without warrant of, &c., ii. 388, Bullin.  
 Not any real essential conveying of grace by corporeal means, ii. 584, Owen

## C. x.

Not represent but convey His body and Himself into us, ii. 473, H. S.  
 The corporal put on and taken off, ii. 725, Scudam.  
 Corporally in Heaven, spiritually in His lively members, ii. 326, Cran.  
 Our souls neither receive nor digest that which is corporeal, ii. 402, Sand.  
 Corporals and lifting the elements, ii. 129, Innoc. III.  
 Not so much by corporal as spiritual and united, ii. 133, De Cœn. D.  
 Corporaliter hardest. May mean without fiction, ii. 577, J. Tay.  
 Corporally He not there in form of bread, ii. 368, Bradf.  
 Without corporeity not true sacrament, ii. 176, Duns  
 Corpus Christi day, carried about and worshipped, ii. 630, Bev.  
 From one term (altar) the correlatives follow, ii. 721, Jacob  
 Liable to corrupt, yet immortal God, ii. 220, Gers.  
 Franciscan doctrine—new creation of body, ii. 35  
 If you think of any supplement to His merits on cross, I renounce, &c., ii. 538, Bram.  
 Different usings of sign of cross, ii. 47, Anselm  
 Crosses made, ii. 167, 8, W. Dur.  
 Mr Scudamore's feelings about the sign of the cross, ii. 729  
 Sign of cross with incense, ii. 97, 8, Honor.  
 Three crossings for the three women, Luke xxiv., ii. 128  
 Cup urged by Jacobelus from Scripture, John vi. &c., ii. 244  
 Denying the cup a sign of ignorance as to value of the Lord, ii. 304, Melanc.  
 If custom good, introduced by Holy Spirit's aid, ii. 301, Bp Fisher  
 τὸν χειρὸς ἵκον ὑμῶν, i. 131, Dion. A.  
 ἡ πόσις συνάγονται, i. 81, Let. Diog.  
 οὐ χωρεῖ εἰς τὸ μὴ εἶναι, i. 558, J. of D.  
 Erat jam in calice, i. 599, Paschas.  
 Idem sanguis jam erat in calice qui in corpore, i. 599, Paschas.  
 Si sang. latere fluentem in calice cruentum potum, ii. 363, P. Mar.  
 Nulla mentio calicis dividendi, i. 401, Fulg.  
 Sicut illi intellexerunt, non sic de carnem, i. 565, Alb.  
 Per carnem Ejus vivemus (John vi.), i. 172, Hil. P.  
 Doctrinam fidei et carnem Meam, ii. 80, B. of Segn.  
 Carnes Agni sacro ore conficiens, i. 292, Jer.



## C. x.

Calicem salutarem gutturi applicaret, i. 452, Prosp.  
 Calicem Christi sanguinem continere, i. 607, Bert.  
 Virtutem elicit ex carne, i. 90, Origen  
 Carnis Christi esum. translatitæ applicari, ii. 412, Beza  
 Penetrare ad nos carnem, ii. 339, Calv.  
 Naturam carnis ad naturam æternitatis, i. 170, Hil. P.  
 Panem carnem, negat Scotus (Erig.), ii. 177, Duns  
 Tetigimus carnes sanctas, i. 90, Origen  
 In eadem carnis formâ atque substantiâ, i. 265, Aug.  
 Ad veritatem carnis pertingit homo malus, ii. 209, Hus.  
 Vere Verbum carnem sumimus, i. 170, Hil. P.  
 Caro sua in veritate sumitur, i. 244, Amb.  
 Sermo caro erat factus, i. 71, Tert.  
 Caro nihil prodest (John vi.), i. 272, Aug., and 273, 276  
 Uno certo die per annum, i. 261, Aug.  
 Unio inter libatum et cibum, &c., ii. 153, Bonav.  
 A communibus cibis differens, ii. 132, Innoc. III.  
 Illius cibo vivere incipimus, &c., i. 460, Chrysost.  
 Ad cælestem cibum quotidianus deferitur, i. 461, Chrysost.  
 Ter crux cum sale et cinere super aquam, ii. 97, Honor.  
 Die cœnæ consecraret, i. e. Passover day, ii. 115, P. Lomb.  
 Inter cœnandum celebratam cœnam non esse, i. 618, Rab.  
 Cogitationes omnes patefacere, i. 471, Leo I.  
 Comedere est cognoscere, i. 95, Origen  
 In commemorationem Ejus, i. 117, Cyp.  
 Comm. qua communiter conveniant, i. 524, Isid. Sev.  
 Communicatio idiomatum inter p. et c. Christi, ii. 181, J. of P.  
 In communionem sancti corporis collocandi, i. 177, Hil. P.  
 Internus commutatum Sp. s. virtute, i. 609, Bert.  
 Jure communicationis, i. 148, Counc.  
 Jure communicationis, i. 121, Cyp.  
 Communicari and *κοινωνεῖν*, i. 115, Cyp.  
 Communio pacis, i. 145, Counc.  
 Litera communicatoria, i. 145  
 Voce tuâ solâ commuta, i. 217, Greg. Naz.  
 Concernere and our concerns, ii. 177  
 Sine ullâ concretæ confusionis labe, i. 236, Amb.

## C. x.

Concomitantur Divinitas et quantitas, ut dicunt, ii. 278, Pasch.  
 Confectio corporis et sanguinis Domini, i. 584, Agob.  
 Conficit esse sub specie panis, ii. 208, Hus.  
 Ad conficiendum Christi corpus, i. 616, Rab.  
 Corpus Domini conficiunt, i. 106, Pon.  
 Divinum ac mysterium sacrif. conficiatur, ii. 179, Blem.  
 Hoc facite si hoc conficite, ii. 245, Sylv.  
 Efficitur...conficitur, ii. 4, Ælf.  
 Sermo conficit sac., i. 238 and 240, Amb.  
 Spirituale conficit panem, i. 288, Jer.  
 Nemo conficere nisi sacerdos, ii. 136, C. L. IV.  
 Secundum res gestas conficitur mysterium, &c., i. 601, Scot.  
 Dei verbo conficitur (non) stolidi figura, ii. 89, Guib.  
 Domini chrisma conficere, i. 107, Fab.  
 Non confirmatum licet opinari oppositum, ii. 279, D. de St P.  
 Prius consecrat quam frangat, aliter Christus, ii. 168, W. Dur.  
 Consubst. not less absurd than transubst., ii. 342 (cum pane copulare)  
 Corpus quomodo ad usum convenit, "quibus modis," i. 615, Rab.  
 Virtute Divina totum convertitur in totum, ii. 149, A. Hales  
 Some say non converti, madness, ii. 117, P. Lomb.  
 Vere, per mysterium p. et v. in c. et s. conversa subst. sumenda, i. 608, Bert.  
 Omnes, tam conversi quam cæteri, ii. 78, St Steph.  
 Convivium Domini, i. 258, Aug.  
 Ipse conviva et convivium, i. 286, Jer.  
 In corde polluto injuria Ejus corpori, i. 230, Pelag.  
 Qui corde facto carnem manducant, i. 524, Ægypt. and i. 254, Isid. Sev.  
 Nihil edere nisi quod corporale, i. 177, Hil. P.  
 Unum suppositum, duas corporeitates, ii. 181, J. de P.  
 In Christi sanguinem corporaliter convertitur, i. 610, Bert.  
 Corporis Sui figuram dedisse, i. 70, and i. e. figuram, corporis Mei, Tert.  
 Corpore reservato, i. 68, Tert.  
 Corporis et sanguinis Sui figuram, i. 271, Aug.  
 Ex corp., ex anim., ex Spirit., ex Deit., &c., ii. 157, Alb. M.  
 Species frangitur, &c., non corpus Christi, ii. 210, Huss

## C. X.

Corpus Domini vivum et vivificum et multipresens, ii. 110, Ger.  
 Verum Christi corpus adesse fidei contempl., ii. 312, Zwin.  
 Ut Christi sit corpus et non aliud quam quod passum, i. 499, Pasch.  
 Propositionis panes et corpus Christi, umbram et corpus, i. 527, Isid. Sev.  
 Christi corpus sancto ore conficiunt, i. 292, Jer.  
 Hoc, quod conficimus, corpus Christi ex Virgine est, i. 629, Hink.  
 In conficiendo corpore Christi, i. 295, Jer.  
 Non verum...quod panis fiat corpus Christi, ii. 278, D. de St P.  
 Sacramentum corporis Christi corpus Christi est, i. 258, Aug.  
 Veraciter esse Christi corpus et sang., ii. 291, Luth.  
 Mens, Christi corpus confectura, i. 294, Jer.  
 Non sacramento tenus sed reverâ corpus Christi manducare (John vi.), i. 270, Aug.  
 Corpus ipsum manducamus, i. 273 and 279, Aug.  
 Particulam corporis Christi tinctam, i. 452, Prosp.  
 Triforme corpus Christi, i. 579, Amal.  
 Sacramentum Dominici corporis et sanguinis investitura, ii. 105, S. Bern.  
 En recevant Son vrai corps, &c., ii. 198, Taul.  
 Corpus Domini canistro, &c., i. 294, Jer., Rossi's discovery  
 Sed quotidiana medicinâ Dominici corporis separare, i. 521, Ægyp.  
 Panis est verum corpus Mariæ, ii. 191, Lyra  
 Non ficto animo apprehendimus corpus, &c., ii. 366, P. Mart.  
 Non quod proprie corpus Ejus sit panis, i. 490, Fac.  
 Virtute Dominici corporis protegente, i. 350, Cass.  
 Res sacramenti corporis veritas, ii. 106, S. Bern.  
 Vitalem corporis Sui virtutem (His life), i. 89, Origen  
 Transferat in corpus, &c., i. 217, Greg. Naz.  
 Oculi pudici, &c.; qui corpus intueri, &c., ii. 327, T. à K.  
 In terris corpus non potest esse post resurr., i. 316, Zwing.  
 Quid faciat duo corpora realiter distincta, ii. 232, Tost.  
 Corpus in hoc mysterio quod creatur, i. 599, Pasch.  
 A corpore non recedamus, i. 122, Cyp.

## C. X.

Prius reficimur sacramento quam corporalibus escis, ii. 190, Lyra  
 Panis ad corpus, vinum ad animam, ii. 190, Lyra  
 Fecit illud Suum corpus &c., i. 424, Gaud.  
 Corpus non in sacramento fragibili modo, ii. 191, Lyra  
 Unum corpus non in duobus locis, ii. 232, Tost.  
 Corpus...ad invisibilia non organicum, ii. 232, Tost.  
 Naturæ propriæ et Sux corpus, i. 175, Hil. P.  
 Corpus et calix figura, quia mysterium, i. 610, Bert.  
 Corpus in quo passum proprium corpus nec in eo figura, i. 610, Bert.  
 Verum corpus Suum quod conceptum, &c., ii. 208, Huss  
 Corpus dicimus quod sumimus, &c., i. 266, Aug.  
 Adesse substantialiter et corporaliter, sed non quantitative, ii. 441, Hosp.  
 Neque corpus oportet in terris realiter adesse, ii. 414, Beza  
 Non eo modo quo putatis erogat corpus Suum, i. 565, Aleuin  
 Nunquam possumus (in) Ejus corpus transire, nisi, &c., i. 590, Ps. Is. D.  
 Ex pane corpus fiat, i. 239, Amb.  
 Ipsummet corpus et ille ipse sanguis, non figura, ii. 372, Haus.  
 Sumunt corpus de manibus Dei, ii. 261, Sav.  
 Convivio corporis Christi et sang. fruuntur, i. 473, St Brig. Cog.  
 Unus ubique...hic plenus, illic plenus; unum corpus, i. 567, Aleuin  
 Spiritu vero corpore et sanguine alimur, ii. 325, Cran.  
 Juxta sacarium lavent, &c., ne forte pulvis Dom. corp., i. 589, Ps. Is. D.  
 Extra hoc corpus neminem vivificat Spiritus Sanctus, i. 257, Aug.  
 Corpus Suum representat in sacramentis, i. 77, Tert.  
 Non corpus ante consec., i. 238, Amb.  
 Febrienti manu corpus, i. 240, Amb.  
 Verba quibus Dom. corpus conficitur, ii. 148, A. Hales  
 Post consecrat. verum corpus, &c., ii. 212, Jer. of P.  
 Corpus incorruptibile tractare, ii. 128, Innoc. III.  
 Comp. simple purity of Council of Ancyra, i. 147  
 Crede et manducasti, i. 274, Aug.  
 Culpa originalis et actualis mundativa, ii. 185, Marsil.  
 Currum mirificæ structuræ, alius Amb. M., i. 642, Ortizius

## C. χ.

Mar. Merc., quoting Cyril A. *carnem vivificatricem*, i. 443

## D. δ.

Monod and Goulburn opposed as to daily, &c., ii. 708  
 Christ daily suffers and dies as often, &c., ii. 72, Rup.  
 Calvin and Goulburn as to daily, &c., ii. 708  
 Danger and guilt of admitting unfit communicants, ii. 186, 7  
 Deacons bearers of the mystery, i. 27, and n.  
 Deacons *βαστάζουσι τὸ σῶμα* (Cant. vii. 14), i. 416, Theod. Cyr.  
 No dead person to have the bread put into his mouth, i. 634, Phot.  
 Common prayers for dead from apostles, i. 527, Isid. Sev.  
 Aesthetic stimulants hindrances to devotion, ii. 722, Jacob  
 Franciscan and Dominican differences, ii. 705, 6, Thirl.  
 To discern or distinguish His body, ii. 613, Barrow  
 The two disciples sent by Christ mean the two covenants, i. 543, Andreas C.  
 To put an end to this unhappy discussion, ii. 341, Calv.  
 As often you receive, &c., you do the work of your redemption, ii. 224, T. à K.  
 Rule when Greek word for "do" means to "offer," ii. 704, Thirl. and 723, Marr.  
 Do this, all that I have done in your presence, ii. 589, Hamm.  
 As God can do it, therefore He does, ii. 34, 35, Fulb.  
 Not what God can, but what will do, ii. 588, Turretin.  
 John xx. No proof Christ came through the doors, ii. 409, Fulke  
 Not enter through doors, but they open at His nod, ii. 588, Turretin  
 Objection to using dress of other sex in plays, i. 127, (Lact.)  
 Story of dying man receiving, ii. 200, Nic. Xanth.  
*δεκτοὺς γενέσθαι εἰς κοινωνίαν*, i. 196, Bas.  
*δεκτικὴν τὴν σάρκα τῆς δωρεᾶς Θεοῦ*, i. 54, Iren.  
*δέλτων ἀνάγνωσις*, i. 493, Ps. Dionys.  
*τῶν ἐν τῇ κτίσει ὑπερτάτης, δεσπ. ἡμῶν θεομήτορος*, i. 571, Niceph. Cons.  
*ἀρχάντου δεσπολνῆς Θεοτόκου*, i. 218, Greg. Naz.  
*ὑπερευλογημένης ἐνδόξου δεσπολνῆς ἡμῶν*, i. 358, Duc.

## D. δ.

*τὸν Δεσπότην μεριζόμενον καὶ διαδόμενον*, i. 421, Euseb. Alex.  
*διάκονοι διδάσκειν*, i. 43 and 44, Just.  
*τὸν διάκονον ἀνευ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου*, i. 138, Ps. Clem.  
*διαφωρία*, i. 161, Euseb. C.  
*ἐπεπρόδησεν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ*, i. 63, Clem.  
*διεξοδικώτατα αὐτὴν ἦδον*, i. 435, Proc.  
*ὁ τῆς διορθώσεως καιρὸς*, i. 377, Cyr. A.  
*δύναμις*, that went from Christ, not said to belong to body, i. 599  
*Da magistrum, i. e. Tert.*, i. 114, Cyp.  
*Dari nobis quotidie*, i. 122, Cyp.  
*Ex eo parum quid deciderat*, i. 93, 103, Origen  
*Aliquid decuti in terram, &c.*, i. 79, Tert.  
*Dentibus teritur, is flagitium*, ii. 522, Hall  
*Licet carnaliter et visibiliter premat dentibus*, i. 276, Aug.  
*Definire non sufficio*, ii. 117, P. Lomb.  
*Defunctis requiem præstat*, ii. 225, T. à K.  
*Pro vivis et defunctis, living and dead*, ii. 126  
*Diptycha*, i. 429 n., Socrates  
*Non putandus ut ubique diffusus*, i. 265, Aug.  
*Diligentiâ consumantur*, i. 134, Ps. Clem.  
*A cæteris non discernens alimentis*, i. 626, P. Nic. I.  
*Dispositio prævia*, ii. 174, Duns  
*Non Hæc est Divinitas Mea quæ confringetur*, i. 392, Nest.  
*Si mane Dominica portio editur*, i. 134, Ps. Clem.  
*Domini sanctum*, i. 120, Cyp.  
*Ne forte pulvis Dominici corporis*, i. 135, Ps. Clem.  
*Frequentandis Dominicis*, i. 119, Cyp.

## E. ε. η.

The eating of the eucharist gives eternal life, ii. 692, W. and W.  
 Eat Christ before. More expressly through, &c., ii. 254, Frith  
 Faithful do, wicked do not eat it, ii. 631, Bev.  
 Wrong to deny Christ eaten and drunken by bodily mouth, ii. 459  
 Faithful do certainly eat, &c., ii. 629, Bev., properly, &c., 630  
 Daily dies, rises, appears and is eaten, ii. 34, Fulb.  
 All not perish who do not eat, &c. (John vi.), ii. 16, Lanf.  
 Judas having eaten overthrows many theories, ii. 456  
 Eating none other thing than belief, &c., ii. 250, Tynd.

E. e. η.

The ecclesiastical policy of the apostles, ii. 721, Jacob  
 If we purge ourselves from great sins, the eucharist effaces small, ii. 598, Boss.  
 Yet not of themselves efficacious, ii. 639, Leib.  
 Solemn representation of Him crucified as in effigie, ii. 613, Barr.  
 Empty erroneous spirituality (without it), ii. 684, Moehl.  
 Not vain and empty sign, *as some say*, ii. 840, Calv.  
 Is "taken and received," empty figure, &c.? ii. 711, Goulb.  
 Dismiss enquiry, prepared not to know what takes place, ii. 436, Bell.  
 Life in eucharist not of itself but of the Spirit, ii. 487, Cornel.  
 Dr Lonsdale, Bishop of Lichfield, on use of term eucharist, i. 20  
 The eucharist given to infants—wine, i. 147  
 Eucharist bona gratia! ii. 115, P. Lomb. and ii. 153, Bonav.  
 The eucharist suggests order of gifts, ii. 696, A. Wilb.  
 The eucharist the medium of communication, John vi., ii. 696, A. Wilb.  
 Eucharist entirely constituted a name of this sacrament by Ignatius, i. 28. See 18  
 Some of the passages on Evening Communion, i. 82  
 In Century XIX. in England, evening communion almost suppressed, i. 624  
 Not always at evening, ii. 47, Anselm  
 Christ's reasons for evening institution, i. 526, Isid. Sev.  
 On Excommunication. New Testament Fathers, Old Testament Fathers, ii. 391—5, Erast.  
 The non-existent appears—the existent is hid—lest we should revolt, ii. 51, Anselm  
 Lord's supper not extension, &c., of Christ's sacrifice, ii. 730, N. T.  
 The exit of Christ from the tomb through the stone, i. 151, Sp. Jus.  
 Explanation of Nicolas, what becomes of it in certain cases, ii. 171, W. Dur.  
*el eikona (φῆς) φεύ τῆς ἀδοξίας*, i. 573, Theod. Stud:  
*μετὰ τὴν εἰσόδουσιν τῶν Θεῶν δώρων*, i. 575, Theod. Stud.  
*ἐκκαλοῦμεν τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, ὅπως ἀποφῆνῃ*, κ.τ.λ., i. 57, Iren.  
*ὡς ναὺς ἐν πελάγει...ἡ ἐκκλησία*, i. 112, Hipp.  
*ἐκκλησιαστήριον* different from *ἐκκλησία*, i. 454, Isid. Pel.

E. e. η.

*ἐμβρίμιον*, i. 330, Pallad.  
*ἐιστερνισμένοι*, i. 135, Ps. Clem.  
*τῇ πρὸς τὸ ἀθάνατον ἐνώσει*, κ.τ.λ., i. 302, Epiph.  
*ἐντὸς τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων σπλάγχων*, i. 204, Greg. Nyss.  
*ὁ ἄρτος...ἠνωμένος Θεότητι...οὐ μία φύσις*, i. 562, J. of D.  
*τὰ πεμπόμενα ἑορταστικά*, i. 635, Phot.  
*τῶν διαβατηρίων ἑορτῇ*, i. 168, Euseb. C. *ὅτε ἐκπληρώπησε*, i. 155, Athan.  
*ἐπιούσιον*, i. 366, Mk. E.  
*τῆς ἑορτῆς καὶ συνάξεως διαλυθείσης*, i. 465, Bas. Sel.  
*ἐπιούσιον* (Lord's Prayer), i. 241, Amb.  
*στόμα Θεοῦ τοὺς ἐπισκόπους*, i. 138, Ps. Clem.  
*ἐπισκόπου καὶ πρεσβυτέρου*, i. 25 and 26, Ignat.  
*Πνεῦμα ἁγίον ἐπιφοιτᾷ, ὡς ... Π. ἃ ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σε*, i. 556, J. of D., i. 558  
*Πν. ἃ ἐπιφοιτᾷ, καὶ γίνεταί σῶμα Χριστοῦ*, i. 556, J. of D.  
*τὴν ἐπιφοίτησιν τοῦ ἁγ. Πν. προσεδόκουν*, i. 435, Proclus  
*ἐποπτικὴ θεωρία*, i. 64, Clem. A.  
*ἐσθίεις καὶ λαβὼν οἶκαδε ἀναχωρεῖς*, i. 345, Chrysost.  
*δι' εὐλογίας τῆς μυστικῆς*, i. 379, Cyr. A.  
*εὐλογῆσας ἀγίαςας κλάσας*, i. 143, Ps. Clem.  
*εἰς εὐλγ'αν ζωοποιῶν ἐν ἄρτι*, i. 382, Cyr. A.  
*τῆς μυστικῆς εὐλογίας*, i. 373, 383, Cyr. A.  
*τὴν εὐχαριστίαν διδῶσιν*, i. 146, Coune.  
*εὐχαριστίαν κλάσας*, i. 142, Ps. Clem.  
*ἐπεμπον εὐχαριστίαν*, i. 161, Euseb. C.  
*καλεῖται εὐχαριστία*, i. 43; *εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν*, 44 and 45, Just.  
*τῆς Θεοδότης εὐχαριστίας*, i. 492, Ps. Dionys.  
*εὐχαριστίας ἐπακούσαντα*, i. 131, Dion. A.  
*τῶν εὐχομένων τὸ εἶπον*, i. 465, Basil. Sel.  
*οἶον ἐφόδιον εἰλφε πρὸς τὴν αἰώνιον ζωὴν*, i. 577, Theod. Stu.  
*Non habent Sp. S., extra ecclesiam*, i. 257, Aug.  
*Ecclesiam in episcopo*, i. 117, Cyp.  
*Seipsum nobis edendum tribuat*, i. 568, Paulin. A.  
 What have we to do but epulari in Domino? to feast in the Lord, ii. 321, Hugh L.  
*Epulum federae* between God and man, ii. 556, Cudw.  
*Gravari eucharistiæ perceptione*, i. 263, Aug.  
*Enlogiarum nomine transmittere*, i. 161, Euseb. C.  
 Excommunications, interdicts, &c., ii. 187, Marsil.

## F.

Quotidianas Salvatoris exequias, i. 617, Rab.  
 Possible inference from fabulous stories, i. 124, G. Th.  
 Not understood without the light of faith, ii. 221, Gerson  
 Lest thing recovered by faith alone, ii. 72, Rupert.  
 Chief object to excite and train faith, and to be a pledge, ii. 367, Melanc.  
 To lean on reason diminishes faith's merit, ii. 149, A. Hales  
 The eucharistic fan, ii. 725, 6, Scudam.  
 Fasting, Morning Communion, attributes to the Apostles, i. 526, Isid. Sev.  
 With exceptions only in fasting, ii. 158, Alb. M.  
 Fasting Communion, ii. 45, Anselm  
 Placuisse magistris ecclesie. Bede, for fasting Communion, i. 546 and 548  
 To be taken fasting, a jejunis. 1 Cor. xi! ii. 116, P. Lomb.  
 Church adds fasting in reverence, ii. 224, Cajetan  
 Frith says, not in one place fathers said Worship sacraments, ii. 256  
 Argument from fathers not saying Christ's body not there, ii. 255, More  
 On what principles to estimate the fathers' sayings, ii. 569, A. Arn.  
 The writings of fathers not a complete test of doctrine of times, ii. 571, A. Arn.  
 As Jewish fathers held double law, written and unwritten, &c., ii. 465, Rain.  
 No sacrifice, only feasts upon the true, ii. 554, Cudw.  
 Not bare and simple figure joined to verities and substance, ii. 258, Cov.  
 Christ used a figurative speech, ii. 335, Ridl.  
 In one sentence figure help twice, "cup" and New Testament, ii. 332, Ridl.  
 Eaten verily and indeed figurative, should not, ii. 678, Hoad.  
 That word cannot stand without a figure, ii. 377, Haus.  
 A figure and a pledge, ii. 24, Bereng.  
 Old drawing of fishes and bread in baskets, ii. 692  
 Quotes "He truly nourishes us by the substance of His flesh," ii. 564, A. Arn.  
 The signs represent unseen food from flesh and blood, ii. 337, Calv.  
 With His flesh and blood He doth spiritually feed, &c., ii. 326, Cran.  
 His real flesh not suffice, and religion perish, ii. 133, Coen. D.

## F.

If "flesh" wicked receive salvation, John vi. 34, ii. 474, H. S.  
 Not flesh of a mere man, but of God, ii. 60, Theophylact  
 That flesh is received spiritually, ii. 324, Cran.  
 John vi., Flesh profiteth nothing, i. 71, Tert.  
 Blending Christ's flesh with ours fights against reason, ii. 453, Hooker  
 Truly given to us...the flesh of the Son of God, ii. 351, Jewel  
 Thy mouth receives the flesh and blood, &c., ii. 48, Anselm  
 The Lord's flesh has a great and unspeakable power, ii. 63, Theophylact  
 When the flesh, &c., on earth, not in Heaven; now not on earth, ii. 379, Vigilius  
 He that meditates, &c., &c., eats His flesh and drinks His blood, ii. 613, Barrow  
 Not think My very flesh profiteth or quickeneth, ii. 630, Bev.  
 Christ spread His life all over and through His real flesh, ii. 339, Calv.  
 Taste in Heaven the Word of God made flesh, ii. 226, T. à K.  
 Wicked receive true flesh and blood sacramentally, ii. 111, Ger.  
 He gave His flesh, after a communion of His flesh, ii. 331, Ridl.  
 Nestorius charged for saying human flesh only taken, ii. 73, Rup.  
 Lady M., from font unsullied to grave, ii. 632, Ken  
 In strength of that immortal food, &c., &c., ii. 632, Ken  
 Not fed by food another man eats, ii. 535, Mede  
 As to forgiveness by Lord's supper, i. 246  
 Body invisible hid under another form, ii. 94, H. de St V.  
 Frequency degenerates into formality unless rise in religion, ii. 708, Goulb.  
 How often—middle frequency, ii. 720, H. Seym.  
 Luke xxiv., Till it be fulfilled, ii. 82, B. of Sig.  
 Profanis fabulis Divina sacramenta, &c., i. 417, Zeno  
 Si hac fame mereamur, &c., i. 233, Amb.  
 Fasces, imperium Rom., ii. 304, Melanc.  
 Ferebatur Christus in manibus Suis (Ps. xxxiv.), i. 271, Aug.  
 Quod norunt fideles, i. 271 and 274, Aug.  
 Ob meritum fidei merces, i. 597, Pasch.  
 Licet in figura manent...non alia quam quas nata est, &c., i. 597, Pasch.

## F.

Magni boni effectiva—non inanis aut figurativa, ii. 38, Guib.  
 Propter sumentium horrorem sapor remanet et figura, i. 594, Haimo  
 Frangi et manere integrum, ii. 122, Alan., videri frangi, 123  
 Fregit, non antequam verba consec., ii. 190, Lyra  
 Fregit species panis remanentes, ii. 191, Lyra  
 Quomodo et quam frequenter, i. 581, Theodulf  
 Fusum in viscera, i. 237, Amb.

## G. γ.

"Given for you," i.e. to God! ii. 715, Vogan  
 Guericke connects Judaic allegories with Gnosticism, i. 85  
 Principal instrument of grace, &c., ii. 668, P. Ricant  
 Jesuit saying the less of grace, the more often we should come, ii. 573  
 Moehler adds to grace, evinced by representation and form, ii. 683  
 The grace of Christ's body, ii. 331, Ridl.  
 Grace cannot come from creature—only dispositions, ii. 263, Sav.  
 γέννημα τέλειον ἐκ τελείου, i. 155, Athan.  
 οὐνοῦ καινοῦ γεννήματος, i. 167, Euseb. C.  
 πολλοὺς οἶδα γενησαμένους καὶ κοινωνήσαντας, i. 422, Euseb. Alex.  
 ἐὰν γεύσῃται τις (eat), i. 422, Euseb. Alex.  
 δοθῇ καὶ ἀκρίβητος γνώσις, i. 102, Origen  
 The γνώσις the supposed essence of the Divine facts, i. 150  
 οὐ γόνυ κλίνομεν, οὐδ' αἰτίαις καταπονόμεθα, i. 169, Euseb. C.  
 Galaticamur, i. 78, Tert.  
 Gratia a Deo solum per creationem, ii. 265, Sav.  
 On gratia ex operante, better than ex operato, ii. 639, Leib.  
 Aliqua virtus—causa gratiæ? ii. 174, Duns  
 Non dant gratiam, ex vi non justificant, ii. 173, Duns  
 Non attingit gratiam actione sua, ii. 175, Duns  
 Quicumque gustaverit hoc non morietur, i. 242, Amb.

## H.

Some say, as far away as Heaven from earth, ii. 640, Leib.  
 From Heaven and no other altar shall He come at latter day, ii. 403, Sand.

## H.

At once in Heaven and among men unconsumed, ii. 75, Rup.  
 Christ locally in Heaven till restitution, &c., ii. 546, Reyn.  
 No occasion to draw Christ from Heaven. He everywhere, ii. 292, Luth.  
 Heaven His resting-place till come to judge, ii. 322, Becon  
 Herbs, lactucas, a seasoning, ii. 230, Tost.  
 Opinions of many heretics preserved in Irenæus; also reminiscences of St John through Polycarp and Papias, i. 50  
 Bellarm. says heretics wont to prefer Greek to Latin, ii. 432  
 Hermas has much on baptism; on Lord's supper nothing, i. 41  
 H. H.'s criticism on "Hoc," ii. 732  
 Hypatia's end, i. 371  
 Hyperbatic terms in F. de Sales as in Andrewes, ii. 492, &c.  
 Most dangerous hyperbolic language, ii. 471, 2, Andrewes  
 Holocausto sufficere, i. 134, Clem.  
 Christ called the victim (hostia) of the altar, ii. 295, Luth.  
 Hostia pura venerandum sacrificium, i. 306, Syl.  
 Quomodo Christus dicatur esse in hostia, ii. 232, Tost.  
 Sacrif., hostia, sang., cruor, i. 530, Isid. Sev.  
 Ut nova hostia novo imponeretur altari, i. 468, Leo I.  
 Hostiam et Sacerdotem (Heb. ix. 14), i. 91, Origen  
 Hostiam offerimus...pro peccatis, &c., ii. 126. In honore Mariæ, &c.  
 Placatio hostiarum, i. 510, Greg. I.  
 Mactavit Sui corporis hostias, i. 525, Isid. Sev.  
 Etiam aliorum hostias per (sacerdotes) acceptaret, i. 105, Tost.

## I. ι.

The very idea much earlier than the very term, i. 466  
 Not even a suspicion of idolatry, ii. 500, Crak.  
 Answer to defence that R. do not think it idolatry, ii. 609, Still.  
 No proof of the asserted illapse of Spirit, ii. 670, Waterl.  
 Regret that prayer for illapse of the Spirit not universal, ii. 728, Scudam.  
 Parallel to temple service as to the illapse, ii. 732, H. H.  
 All reference to illapse of the Spirit, &c., expressed, ii. 710, Goulb.

## I. ι.

A spiritual incorporation peculiar to this ordinance, ii. 585, Owen  
 No increase takes place, ii. 118, P. Lomb.  
 How the church came to innovate so far, i. 623  
 What the whole church adopted is equal to inspired, ii. 505, Thorn.  
 Instances of public bowing to Christ's example, ii. 609, Still.  
 Argument against Protestantism from imperfect following of institution, ii. 298, H. VIII.  
 Fitness of Christ's evening institution. We not obliged, ii. 592, Outr.  
 What the day of the institution, i. 64, Theophylact  
 Distinguished instrument, cause and principal agent, ii. 364, Lav.  
 Intention of a priest essential, Trent and Florence Council, ii. 607, 8, Still.  
 Illogical to draw presence on earth from Heaven by intercession, ii. 704, Thirl.  
 Whose office to be subintercessors, &c. ii. 654, Baxt.  
 Interpenetration, ii. 625, Limb. But see Haag on First Gen. Council  
 Philo-like interpretation of uncertain things, i. 534, Max.  
 The liberal interpretation, &c., ii. 715, 716, and 717, Vogan  
 Invocation of Spirit in many liturgies, but is not essential, ii. 681, Palm.  
 The true criticism of the word, is, ii. 724, Marr.  
*ιεράρχαι* (bishops), i. 114, Hip.  
*ιεράς επικαλυμματίδος*, i. 575, Theod. Stu.  
*τὸ ιερατεῖον ὅλον ἐπιθυμία*, i. 575, Theod. Stu.  
*ιερατεύειν* Σοι, i. 186, Ps. Clem.  
*ιερατεῖν νομίμως ιερεὺς*, i. 375, Cyr. A.  
*ιερατικαὶ λειτουργίαι*, i. 146  
*κατάλογος ὁ ιερατικός*, i. 141, Ps. Clem.  
*βασιδέων κρείττους οἱ ιερεῖς*, i. 140, Ps. Clem.  
*ερεῖς Θεοῦ κριτήσθε* (Is. lxi. 67), i. 195, Bas.  
*εἰ μὴ διὰ τῶν ιερῶν Αὐτοῦ*, i. 45, Just.  
*ἐπιτελοῦντες λειτουργίαν*, i. 166, Euseb. C.  
*ὡς ιερεὺς καὶ ιερεῖον*, i. 499, Eutych. Const.  
*τῶν ἀναίμακτον λειτουργίαν ἐπιτελέσω*, i. 356, Duc.  
*τὸ τῆς φρακτῆς καὶ θείας λειτουργίας μυστ.*, i. 235, Gen.  
*τὴν τοῦ Δεσποτικοῦ σώματος μυστικὴν λειτουργίαν*, i. 434, Procl.  
*μηδεὶς ἀμφιβόλῃαν μετὰ τὴν μυστικὴν λειτουργίαν*, i. 500, Eutych. Const.  
*το Θεῖον σῶμα τὰ ιερομνησκόμενον*, i. 222, Cæs.  
*ἐξιδεύμενος τὸν Θεόν*, i. 188 & 189, Cyr. J.  
*Per illareum super illam Spirit. S.*, i. 866, Cyr. A.

## I. ι.

*Per illapsum exhibeat panem corpus*, i. 184, Euseb. Em.  
*Omni die populus immolatur*, i. 258, Aug.  
*Signis mysticis antequam immolaretur*, ii. 284, Eras.  
*Immolandus. Signis mysticis representare*, ii. 284, Eras.  
*Solo gustu immortalitatem*, i. 126, Mac. M.  
*Per intercessionem dominæ*, i. 218, Greg. Naz.

## J.

The difficulty of a Jewish Christian church, i. 406, Theod. Cyr.  
 Jewish terms imported, i. 315, Sulp.  
 Ignatius protests against Judaizing, i. 20 and 27  
 Correspondence of laws of Numa Pompilius to Judaism, i. 74, Tert.  
 Christian Judaistic fables most of Jewish origin, i. 60  
 Judas, unable to bear, &c., went out, ii. 133, De Ccen. D.  
 Papists say immediate instruments and efficient causes of justification, ii. 496, Willett  
 Justinian unscripturally raises the doctrine of this sacrament several degrees higher than Ignatius left it, i. 42  
 Jejunium ante vespertinum offic. solvi non debeat, i. 581, Theod.  
*Nefas jejunium, de geniculis adorare*, i. 79, Tert.  
*Quarta et sexta jejunat eccl.*, i. 259, Aug.  
 Nonnisi a jejunis, excepto die anniversario, i. 470, Leo I.  
 A jejunis semper accipitur, i. 261, Aug.  
 Jejunia, &c., et sordes, i. 75, Tert.

## K. κ.

What days to kneel, what to stand, ii. 54, Ivo  
*κάκελλα*, i. 552, Germ. Const.  
*ὕπὸ τῆς φιλοχρηματίας καρηβαρύντα*, i. 457, Isid. Pel.  
 How to interpret *καταγγέλλω*, ii. 723, 4, Marr.  
*καταλληλότερον*, i. 85, Origen  
*ἡ μία κεφαλή*, i. 109, Hip.  
*ἐκέρασεν... εἰς τὴν πάρθενον τὴν ἑαυτοῦ Θεότητα*, i. 111, Hip.  
 Confusion, κίβωτος and ciborium, i. 540, Sophron., and 551, Germ. Const.  
*τὸν Χριστὸν μετὰ πιστοῦ ἀνακινῶσα*, i. 519, Ammon.  
*συνακινρασθαι τοῖς ἡμετέροις σώμασι*, i. 382, Cyr. A.  
*σώμασι κατακινῶμενος*, i. 302, Epiph.

## Κ. κ.

κοιλίας τὴν παλάμην δέχον, i. 188, Cyr. J.  
 ἡ συνειδήσις κοινοί, κ.τ.λ., i. 100, Or.  
 θεοειδεὶ συμπύξει τὴν πρὸς τὸ Ἐν κοινωνίαν, i. 492, P. Diony.  
 τοὺς μοναχοὺς καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν κοινω-  
 νεῖν, i. 336, Pall.  
 τὸ κοινωνεῖν τοῖς ἑγγιστα τοῦ θύματος, i. 213, Greg. Naz.  
 περὶ τοῦ ἀφ' ἐαυτῶν κοινωνεῖν μονάζοντας, i. 574, Theod. Stu.  
 ὑπὲρ τῶν κεκοιμημένων, i. 185, Cyril, and 188  
 τὸ μὴ κοινωνεῖν λίμος καὶ θάνατος, i. 344, Chrysost.  
 κοινωνία not μετοχή, ii. 64, Theophylact  
 κοινωνία, large sense from Damasc., ii. 162, T. Aquin.  
 κοινωνία defined, i. 454, Isid. Pel.  
 ἡ ἀγία κοινωνία σῶα καὶ ἀβροχοὶ διέμεινε, i. 538, Mosch.  
 τῶν τὴν κοινωνίαν διακομίζουσῶν γυναικῶν, i. 683, Phot.  
 ἀόρατον καὶ μυστικὴν κοινωνίαν ἐγνωρίσα-  
 μεν, i. 201, Bas.  
 τὴν μυστικὴν τῆς ἀγίας τραπέζης κοινωνίαν, i. 409, Theod. Cyr.  
 τί λέγω κοινωνίαν; αὐτοῦ ἐσμεν τὸ σῶμα, i. 562, J. of D.  
 βασιλεία ὑποδέχσθαι διὰ τῆς κοινωνίας, i. 334, Chrysost.  
 τυγχάνεωσαν τῆς κοινωνίας, i. 149  
 κοινωνίαν κατέχοντες, i. 198, Bas.  
 ἐν ἑκατέρᾳ μορφῇ μετὰ τῆς θατέρου κοι-  
 νωνίας, i. 559, J. of D.  
 κοινωνοὶ of idols not spiritually eaten, ii. 677, Hoad.  
 κοινωνοὶ ὁμνωδίας, i. 187, Cyr. J.  
 κοινωνοῦμεν καὶ τῆς Θεότητος, i. 213, Greg. Naz.  
 μυστικά Αὐτοῦ κράματα, i. 221, Cæs.  
 ἐδόθη κρέας ἡματωμένων, i. 330, Pallad.  
 τὰ δὲ παμμακάριστα κρέα κ.τ.λ. i. 448, Nil.  
 τὴν Κυριακὴν, The Lord's day, i. 420, Euseb. Alex.  
 ἐν τῇ τῆς Κυριακῆς ἡμέρᾳ, i. 160, Euseb.

## Λ. λ.

Taking lamb to temple contrary to law of Moses, ii. 557, 8  
 Christ said Eat, not strike through with lance, ii. 37, Humb.  
 Latin church greater authority now than Greek, ii. 246, Sylv.  
 Why wives under the law, i. 533, Max.  
 Life is therein, and it giveth immortality, &c., ii. 4, Ælf.  
 Maximus tells of uneven number loaves and cups, i. 531 and 532

## Ι. λ.

Arguments not affected by introducing word Logos, ii. 736  
 1 Cor. xi. on rich and poor at love feasts, i. 439, Eucher.  
 λαικοὺς πειθαρχεῖν, i. 138, Ps. Clem.  
 οἱ λειτουργήσαντες Μοι ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτὶς, i. 114, Hip.  
 τὸ φοβερὸν τῆς Θελας λειτουργίας, i. 449, Nil.  
 On the word λειτουργία, i. 434  
 ἐρρώννυτο τῆς λειτουργίας, i. 213, Greg. Naz.  
 λεξιθῆναι, i. 62, Clem. A.  
 ἡ λόγῃ καὶ οἱ ἥλοι... τὰ ἀγιασθέντα καὶ Θεοθέντα, i. 374, Theod. Stu.  
 τὴν ἀγίαν λόγῃ ἐν δεξιῇ μέρει τῆς σφρα-  
 γίδος, i. 357, Duo.  
 ἄλλος ὁ λόγος, Paul S., i. 149  
 Non licet, &c., prius cibi laici sumptu, i. 625, P. Nic. I.  
 Dominus regnavit a ligno, i. 69, Tert. and 81, 82, Ps. xvi.  
 Dulcissimo hie liquamine confecto Divinitatem sorbitare, i. 617, Rab.  
 In locis plurimis possit esse, &c., ii. 217, Gers.

## Μ. μ.

Magical effects attributed to bread and wine, ii. 685, Haag  
 But give Divine worship to the very manhood of Christ, ii. 537, Bram.  
 Manna varied in taste at every one's desire, i. 544, Apon.  
 The cultus of the virgin Mary at issue, Cent. iv., i. 388  
 Mary's intercession prayed for, i. 496, Germ.  
 The mass sacrifice not grounded on God's written word, ii. 399, Geste  
 Man persuaded that mass a good work and sacrifice, ii. 294, Luth.  
 Many priests know nothing but to mass, keep out better, ii. 347, Asch.  
 Christ not so sacrificed in mass that dieth, &c., ii. 258, Cov.  
 On many masses in a day, ii. 112, Pet. Cant., and against wicked communi-  
 cating  
 On private massing, ii. 397, Geste  
 How Christ's body in every mass—1,000 places, ii. 57, Guim.  
 Romanists thought a mass a sacrifice, or their church had none, ii. 674, Water.  
 The mass has practically taken the place of everything, ii. 846, Asch.  
 What masses for the dead approved, ii. 669, Thiers  
 Application of masses for living and dead wrong, ii. 306, Melane.  
 The sacrifice of the mass, different priest



## M. μ.

- from that of the cross, &c., ii. 537, Bram.  
 If masses necessarily blest, Popes holiest of men, ii. 241, Wesel  
 Christ's body not in every pix, altar, massmonger's hands, &c., ii. 322, Becon  
 Poem on deliverance of a soul by masses, i. 567, Alcuin  
 Comparison of outward show, Our Lord and a massing priest, ii. 344, Asch.  
 The blessing not to be materialized in elements, ii. 710, Goulb.  
 Bread and wine—medicament and holocaust, ii. 133, De Cœn. D.  
 Christ delivered a memorial or remembrance instead of a sacrifice, ii. 450, R. Abb.  
 Hinkmar says J. Scot held it a memorial, ii. 22  
 A memorial does not mean only a mere memorial, ii. 22  
 The memorial or doctrine of eucharist. Answer by Bp Thirlwall, ii. 703  
 Memorial repudiates there being present real flesh and blood, ii. 703, Thirl.  
 Merit done, of congruity defined, ii. 589, Turretin  
 Justin and Irenæus among the holders of sober Millennarianism, i. 42  
 No miracle in it, all accustomedly, ii. 359, Hoop.  
 Object to misapplying passages contrary to author's meaning, ii. 701, Goode  
 Dissension about mode only, ii. 459, Sarav.  
 Whether two modes—*utrum duo modi*, ii. 275, D. de St P.  
 In what mode He only knows, ii. 81, B. of Seg.  
 We only differ in modo, in the way of being, ii. 331, Ridl.  
 Refinements as to "modes" not belong to early ages, ii. 737  
 Mode of Lord's supper among Tartars, ii. 145, R. Bacon  
 Praise of monastic life by Fulbert, pupil of Gerbert, ii. 32  
 This blessing given by God to Moses, by Christ to S. F. of A., ii. 144  
 Letter to Dignetus has not the word mystery for this sacrament, i. 32  
 One of the great mysteries of the Roman magic and juggling, ii. 534, Owen  
 Pious ancients say Great mystery, not if receive sign only, ii. 641, Leib.  
 ὁ τὸ Θεῖον μάννα κατεδηδοκώς, i. 102, Origen  
 ἐν μεθίξει γενώμεθα τῆς ἀγίας σαρκὸς, i. 885, Cyr. A.  
 μεθίστησιν αὐτὰ πρὸς ἐνέργειαν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ σαρκὸς, i. 383, Cyr. A.

## M. ρ.

- πολλὰς εὐχὰς ἐμελπον, i. 435, Procl.  
 δεξάμενος τὴν σταλαίσαν μερίδα, i. 537, Mosch.  
 μεριζόμενον καὶ αὐτὸ οὐ μειούμενον, i. 205, Greg. Ny.  
 διαμερίζω τὰ μέλη, i. 157, Athan.  
 εἰσαεὶ καταμεριζόμενον, i. 205, Greg. Ny.  
 μεταβάλλειν τὰ σώματα, i. 109, Hipp., and μεταβολὴν, 110  
 μεταβάλλω, i. 185 and 187, Cyr. J.  
 κατὰ μεταβολήν, i. 43, Just., as i. 62, Clem. A.  
 πρὸς ἐσπέραν μεταλαμβάνουσιν, i. 429, Socrates  
 τοῦτο ὁ μεταλαμβάνων ... φαρτὸν ἐστὶ, κ.τ.λ., i. 557 and 558, J. of D.  
 μεταλαμβ. τ. εὐχ. μηκέτι εἶναι φαρτὰ, i. 53, Iren.  
 ἀδύνατον ἄφρατον λαβεῖν ... εἰ μὴ μεταλάβοι, i. 447 and 449, Nil.  
 μεταλαμβάνειν τοῦ Θεοῦ σώματος, i. 556, J. of Damascus  
 μετὰ τὴν μετάληψιν ἄφρατος ἐστὶ τὴν σύστασιν, i. 556, J. of D.  
 τὴν Θεῖαν μετάληψιν, κ.τ.λ., i. 56, Cœcum. in Iren.  
 ἕως τῆς ἡμῶν μετάληψεως ... ὑπὸ μυνῶν καὶ σκωλήκων, i. 558, J. of D.  
 ὅσοι ἐν μετανοίᾳ ἀπέλθετε πάντες, i. 341, Chrysost.  
 πρὶν ἢ ταῦτα διὰ τῆς μετανόας ἀπονιψασθαι, i. 422, Euseb. Alex.  
 αἷμα ἐξ οἴνου ἀληθῶς καὶ ἀρρήτως μεταποιούμενον, i. 563, J. of D.  
 ἄρτον εἰς σῶμα μεταποιεῖσθαι, i. 802, Epiph.  
 τὸ δὲ σῶμα πρὸς τὴν Θεικὴν ἀξίαν μετεποιήθη, i. 302, Epiph.  
 ἡ ἐπιφοιτήσαν μεταποίησιν, i. 218, Greg. Naz.  
 μεταποιεὶ καὶ μετατίθησιν, i. 204, 205, 206, and 207, Greg. Nyss.  
 μεταστοιχείωσας, i. 207, Greg. Nyss.  
 ἐπὶ τῇ Θεώσει καὶ μεταστοιχείωσει τοῦ σώματος, i. 506, Anasta. S.  
 εἰς Ἑμὲ μεταστοιχειούμενος, i. 383, Cyr. A.  
 μετασχῶν τοῦ ἁγιάσματος, i. 208, Greg. Nyss.  
 τὸ μετέχειν συνεχῶς, i. 198, Basil.  
 Μάμονας μόνου κοινοῦ ἄρτου μετέχειν, i. 571, Niceph. Const.  
 ἐμφοβοὶ μετέχοντες, κ.τ.λ., i. 283, Did.  
 ἡριστήκοτες ἤδη, μετέχουσι, i. 431, Socrates  
 ἀληθὴ διὰ τὸ σῶζειν τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν μετεχόντων, i. 519, Ammon.  
 τῇ μετοχῇ κοινοτέρα τὴν κλάσιν, i. 220, Cæs.  
 τῇ μετοχῇ τῶν ἁγίων, i. 132, Dion. A.  
 τὴν τῆς μετοχῆς κοινωνίαν, i. 340, Theod. M.  
 ἀμέτοχος τῶν μυστικῶν ἁγιασμάτων, i. 208, Greg. Nyss.

M. μ.

μετουσία, i. 209, Greg. Nyss.  
 μετουσίωσις, Greek for transubstantiation.  
 ii. 234, Cyr. L.  
 Three compounds of μετά besides μετου-  
 σίουσθαι, ii. 236, Dos.  
 μητέρα Θεοῦ, ii. 155, Ni. Chon.  
 ταῖς πρεσβείαις τῆς παραχράντου Αὐτοῦ  
 μητέρος, i. 362, Duc.  
 τὸ πάθος τοῦ Τιοῦ αἰετ μμεῖται, i. 512,  
 Greg. I.  
 ἡ ἀγία τράπεζα τὸ μνημεῖον, i. 540, So-  
 phron.  
 εἰς ἀνεξάλειπτον μνήμην, i. 193, Bas.  
 αἰετ μνημονεύμεν, κ.τ.λ., i. 193, Bas.  
 μυσταγωγία of Max. refers to Christ's  
 death, i. 536  
 τὴν Θεῖαν ἐπιτελεῖν μυσταγωγίαν, i. 355,  
 Duc.  
 τῆς φοικτῆς μυσταγωγίας τὴν ἔνστασιν,  
 i. 465, Bas. Sel.  
 μυστήριον disconnat, ii. 387, Bullin.  
 τὸ μυστήριον ὅπλον καὶ ἀνατέλχισμα τῆς  
 ψυχῆς, i. 372, Cyr. A.  
 ποιεῖ τὸ μυστήριον, Christ's instituting it,  
 i. 297, Epiph.  
 τὸ μυστήριον γίνεται Ἰασμός, ii. 234,  
 Cyr. L.  
 πάντοτε ἐπιτελεῖσθαι τὰ μυστήρια, i. 398,  
 Theod. M.  
 τῆς κοινωνίας τῶν Θεῶν μυστηρίων, i. 420,  
 Socrates  
 ἐπιτελεῖσθαι μυστήριον, i. 160, Euseb. C.  
 προσεῖναι τοῖς ἱεροῖς μυστηρίοις, i. 334,  
 Chrysost.  
 ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μυστηρίῳ, i. 513,  
 Greg. I.  
 τῶν ἱερῶν μυστηρίων ἀψασθαι, i. 456, Isid.  
 Pel.  
 μυστήριον τοῦ αἵματος τε καὶ σώματος  
 ἐπιτελεῖν, i. 322, Mar.  
 μεμυσταγωγῆμενα τῶν ἀχράντων μυστηρίων,  
 i. 131, Dion. A.  
 τῶν ἀγίων καὶ οὐρανίων μυστηρίων ὑπο-  
 δοχὴν, i. 326, Pallad.  
 τῶν ἐπουρανίων Σου καὶ ἀθανάτων μυστη-  
 ρίων, i. 360, Duc.  
 τῆς διδόσεως τοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μυστηρίων,  
 i. 327, Pallad.  
 τῶν ἀχράντων καὶ ἀγίων μυστηρίων, i. 319,  
 Eph. S.  
 ἡ τῶν Θεαρχικῶν μυστηρίων τῷ τελομένῳ  
 μεταδόσις, i. 492  
 ἀγίων μυστηρίων ψαύειν καὶ ἱερουργίαν,  
 i. 301, Epiph.  
 τοῦ κατὰ Χριστὸν μυστηρίου τὴν μόρφωσιν,  
 i. 378, Cyr. A.  
 τὰ τῆς ἀληθείας μυστήρια εἰς τύπους μετα-  
 λαμβάνων, i. 574, Theod. Stud.  
 τῶν μυστηρίων τῶν πνευματικῶν, i. 337,  
 Chrysost.  
 (θυσίαν) τῶν μεγάλων μυστηρίων ἀντίτυπον,  
 i. 213, Greg. Naz.

M. μ.

τῶν ἱερῶν μυστηρίων ἡ πανήγυρις... ἡ ἐσ-  
 πέρα, i. 434, Procl.  
 ζωποίων μυστηρίων, i. 360, Duc.  
 τῶν φοικτῶν μυστηρίων, ii. 235, Cyr. L.  
 τὰ μυστικά σύμβολα οὐκ οικείας ἐξίσταται  
 φύσεως, i. 410, Theod. Cyr.  
 ἐπεύχεται μυστικῶς, i. 359, Duc.  
 μύστιν ἐδωδὴν, i. 216, Greg. Naz.  
 Ne a malo minus perficitur, ii. 208,  
 Hus.  
 Malos mortificat, i. 277, Aug.  
 Psalm xxi., manducaverunt et adorave-  
 runt, i. 262, Aug.  
 Qui recolit spiritualiter manducat, &c.,  
 ii. 207, Hus.  
 Peccator manducat ad iudicium, i. 597,  
 Paschas.  
 Seipsum manducavit Christus in cenā,  
 ii. 215, Gers.  
 Ad osculanda vincula martyris, i. 80,  
 Tert.  
 Quotidie ad medelam animæ, i. 439,  
 Chrom.  
 Calvin attempted a via media, ii. 336,  
 Calv.  
 Medicinaspiritualis, purificat sibi devotum,  
 i. 618, Rab.  
 Memoria est absentium, ii. 448, Par.  
 (Memory refers to absent things.)  
 Memoria redemptionis ut memores, &c.,  
 i. 618, Rab.  
 Memoria renovaretur, ii. 284, Eras.  
 Sub horam terribilis mensæ, i. 307,  
 Syl.  
 Meracum eis poculum propinat, i. 96,  
 with miscuerit, Origen  
 Metaschematism or Metousiasm, An-  
 cientis, ii. 644, Leib.  
 Ministrat et ministratur, i. 232, Amb.  
 Missa, quia tunc emittebantur foris, ii.  
 148, A. Hales  
 Quando missa celebratur, Gratian, i. 141,  
 Ps. Clem.  
 Sanctæ genetricis semperque vir. mis-  
 sam, i. 566, Alcuin  
 On the word Missa, ii. 481, Morton.  
 (Missa est communio.)  
 Missarum solennia nequaquam nisi in  
 eccl., i. 590, Ps. Is. D.  
 Missas agere, i. 123, Corn.  
 Missas celebrare, i. 137, Ps. Clem.  
 Quotidie pro vobis mortuum, i. 628,  
 Hink.  
 Commutat invisibilis Sacerdos visibiles  
 creaturas in, &c., i. 594, Haimo  
 Peragere ipsa mysteria, i. 584, Agob.  
 Mysterii celestis involuti in orario, i.  
 237, Amb.  
 Ne vacuus mysterii, i. 236, Amb.  
 Mysterium and sacramentum, i. 179  
 In mysterio panis refuit immolatus, i.  
 424, Gaud.

## M. μ.

*Mysterium corporis et sanguinis*, i. 244, Amb.  
*Super mens. Dom. positum mysterium illius in quo passus, &c.*, i. 611, Bert.

## N. ν.

It is gone over into God's nature, ii. 81, Theophylact  
 He that nourishes and the nutriment are one, ii. 197, Taul.  
*ὥσπερ τις νεοτελής, κ.τ.λ.*, i. 465, Basil. Sel.  
 A note in Migne on Chrysostom omits *οὐ νηστεία ἐστίν*, i. 283, Did.  
*νοεῶν καὶ δοκῶν*, ii. 155, Nic. Chon.  
*τοῖς νομίμοις τοῦ Θεοπότην*, i. 16, Clem. R.  
*Naturalis proprietates*, i. 171, Hil. P.  
 M. M. quoting Nestorius *ex naturæ propriæ possibilitate*, i. 444  
*Nocturnis convocationibus* ..... Comm. Dom. i. 80, Tert.  
*Numquam alligatam ipsis gratiam, not tied to them*, ii. 341, Calv.

## O. ο. ω.

Offer appeasing hosts, &c., ii. 666, Pontif. R.  
 Makes us worthy to offer, &c., for sins, ii. 660, Wilson  
 This day we offer Him again to God, ii. 472, Andrewes  
 We will not offer Him to His Father, &c., &c., ii. 520, Hall  
 Pious desires of saints offered as propitiatory, ii. 223, T. & K.  
 The sacrifice to be offered again, every time church filled, ii. 54, Ivo  
 Unlawful to think Christ can be offered by any but Himself, ii. 484, Arm.  
 No Scripture proof that Christ offered material element of body in eucharist, ii. 674, Water.  
 If it required to be offered would He not have instituted it so? ii. 296, Luth.  
 Christ offering Self to God continually through the priest, ii. 648, Leib.  
 We always offering Himself, one not many, ii. 28, Bereng.  
 Ministered as Mediator in Heaven moment of offering Self, ii. 590, Outr.  
 The offering was on the cross, i. 269, Aug.  
 About the opinions of the Greeks, ii. 603, 4, Claude  
 Optical and sensible illustrations of failing perception, ii. 221, Gers.  
 Order of acts of our Lord, ii. 517, and the words, 518

## O. ο. ω.

In holy orders God institutes organs to do this, ii. 683, Moehl.  
 The distinctively Christian ordinance, ii. 708, Goulb.  
*ὀρανοῦ καταγγελτικοῖς*, i. 168, Euseb. C.  
*ὁμοφύριοι*, i. 552, Germ. Const.  
*τὸ στοιχάριον ὅν τῷ ὡραρίῳ*, i. 356, Duc.  
*ζῶννυται τὸ ὡράριον αὐτοῦ σταυροειδῶς*, i. 361, Duc.  
*Semel oblata est hostia...per singulos dies offerimus*, i. 566, Alc.  
*Ordo orationum quibus oblata Deo sacrificia consecrantur*, i. 528, Isid. Sev.  
*Particulam oblatae immissæ in calicem*, i. 578, Amal.  
*Oblatio gratiarum rursus pro ea fit*, i. 453, Prosp.  
*Quotidiana oblatio quotidiane remissio*, i. 531, Isid. Sev.  
*Pro dormitione oblatio*, i. 145  
*Oblatione Tui pretiosis corporis*, ii. 226, T. & K.  
*Oblationes Levitis superponendas altaribus*, i. 528, Isid. Sev.  
*Sanctificationem oblationis*, i. 529, Isid. Sev.  
*Occultæ, in occulto, &c.*, i. 97, Origen  
 To Ratram, Erigena, &c., nihil aliud videtur quam oculis, &c., i. 599, Pasch.  
*Offeramus pro populo sacrificium*, i. 233, Amb.  
 Non eis (angelis) corpus Christi offeratur, i. 585, Agob.  
 Christo offerenda sacrificia, i. 285, Jer.  
 Victimæ offerre pro populo, i. 292, Jer.  
 Offerre sine intermissione, i. 53, Iren.  
 Cum ad cœnandum... offerimus, i. 119, Cyp.  
 Per nos dies singulos offerri, i. 474, Nic. Ag.  
 Offero hostias placationis pro illis, &c., ii. 226, T. & K.  
 Ipse offertur, quando corpus, i. 234, Amb.  
 Mane offertur...ad vesperam vero, &c., i. 262, Aug.  
 Non causant gratiam—ex op. operato, i. 163, T. Aquin.  
 Opere operato, by force and virtue of work and word in sacraments, ii. 496, Willett  
 Non opus meretur, &c., præter Filii mortem, ii. 303, Melanc.  
 Ligari fecit in orario, &c., i. 236, Amb.  
 Ornatum et stratum, i. 98, Origen

## P. π. φ. ψ.

In a latent way—impanated, ii. 57, Guim.

## P. τ. φ. ψ.

If the Lord's supper in paradise, no fall, i. 534, Max.  
 A peculiar participation of Christ as in no other rite, ii. 586, Owen  
 Particular points pressed by particular great fathers, i. 370  
 Three parts! Church of England says two, ii. 457, Sarav.  
 Passover fulfilled in Lord's supper, ii. 723, Marr.  
 The passover on the fourteenth day at even, i. 440, Hesych.  
 The killing of passover in temple a day before not be suffered, ii. 557, Cudw.  
 Proper details of passover ceremonies, ii. 556, Cudw.  
 If what Christ did was perfect, away with additions, ii. 545, Reyn.  
 Periodicity, a law of these opinions, i. 611  
 More than to look at a picture and be touched, ii. 708, Goulb.  
 Ikonoborists, wrestlers with pictures, ii. 666, Platon  
 Greater precision of language now needed, ii. 578  
 Remove every imagination of local presence, ii. 341, Calv.  
 The presence they hold is neither literal nor figurative, ii. 704, Thirl.  
 Not only Divine, but human presence, ii. 417, Chemn.  
 A presence in, with, or under, not much different from Transubstantiation, ii. 688, Haag  
 By presence spiritually, to our spirits only, ii. 577  
 What the meaning of the spiritual presence of a substance, ii. 579, B. Heber  
 None other presence required than a spiritual, ii. 319, Hugh Lat.  
 Lord's supper pledge and signing of His presence, ii. 417, Mald.  
 A presence by grace not corporally, ii. 369, Bradf.  
 Deny presence in natural substitution, grant presence by grace, ii. 329, Ridl.  
 Could not doubt presence of Godhead; but of humanity, ii. 416, Chemn.  
 Beyond properties, &c., presence in many places, ii. 420, Chemn.  
 Hooker's saying cannot prove objective presence, ii. 704, Thirl.  
 The belief of double presence dropped to that of only accidents, ii. 540, Cosin  
 Objections to double presence of body insuperable, ii. 715, Vogan  
 Some Berengarians hold a latent presence (like impanation), ii. 24

## P. τ. φ. ψ.

That feigned (of many), of Christ's bodily presence a papistical invention, ii. 320, Hugh Lat.  
 Council II., of Nicæa, decided the proper bodily presence, ii. 614, Tillotson  
 Treatise Catechism on Apostles' Creed, argument against belief bodily presence, ii. 470, Rain.  
 It (a carnal presence) destroyeth the institution, ii. 330, Ridl.  
 Bell. advises corporal presence sparingly taken up, ii. 521, Hall  
 Entire presence of the manhood and Godhead, ii. 706, Thirl.  
 Against multipresence, ii. 417, Chemn.  
 Dean Goode's tremendous *refutation* of spiritual presence of body, ii. 699  
 Roots of the weeds, doctrine of real presence, ii. 325, Cran.  
 Divine efficiency proves (real) presence, ii. 132, De Cæn. D.  
 Article XXVIII. intended to deny any real natural presence of Christ's body, ii. 583, Dr More  
 Real and substantial presence not in the tropical words, ii. 362, P. Mart.  
 A real objective presence of the things called, &c., ii. 715, Vogan  
 Real presence after manner of existence of a spirit, ii. 699  
 Bev. attributes real presence and transubstantiation to Damascenus and Amal., ii. 628  
 (1) Not a corporal, but (2) a real presence, undefined way, ii. 697, Arch. Den.  
 The fathers mean real presence under the bread, &c., ii. 717, Vogan  
 Corporal equivalent to real and essential presence, ii. 728, Scudam.  
 Denial that there can be a real presence of body or blood, ii. 715, Vogan  
 Unless a real presence, Christ not taken and received, ii. 733, Lidd.  
 Only a real presence of Christ's invisible power and grace, ii. 656, Wake  
 Dr Schaff, spiritual real presence, &c., ii. 713  
 Immaterial and spiritual way of real presence, ii. 697, Arch. Den.  
 Presence under symbols, &c., means, that it not there itself, ii. 579, B. Heber  
 How Thou, in Heaven, art present, &c., I by no means comprehend, ii. 633, Ken  
 Present really and truly, but spiritually and ineffably, ii. 703, Mem.  
 No otherwise present than as in His Word, ii. 370, Bradf.  
 No otherwise present than symbolically, &c., ii. 609, Usher

## P. π. φ. ψ.

What is in no way present, can in no way be eaten, ii. 449, Pareus  
 Glorified human body not present in many places, ii. 521, Hall  
 Stillingleet—Christ's body not present after manner of a spirit, ii. 606  
 A body present as a thought to mind, is spiritually present, ii. 704, Thirl.  
 Present to, &c., that made sacramentally and representatively the body, &c., ii. 652, R. Baxt.  
 If He really present, the supper would cease, ii. 330, Ridl.  
 Reasons for the translation "elder," instead of "priest," ii. 409, Fulke  
 When Christ's priesthood began, i. 404, Theod. Cyr.  
 Putting "priest" in Rhemish Version for "elder," ii. 464  
 A priest has made Christ when own life been good, ii. 588  
 Doubt as to priest's intent, ii. 258, Cov.  
 No promise, that come down at every priest's calling, ii. 401, Grind.  
 Priest not on earth doing what Christ does in Heaven, ii. 730, N. T.  
 Bible-priests only, ii. 245, Sylv.  
 Functions of priests in private houses, i. 505, Agob.  
 Private men not to define; particularly, supreme pontiff, ii. 645, Leib.  
 Details of Procession, i. 497, Germ. P.  
 He cannot be conceived to have meant properly, ii. 516, Usher  
 Take away part of properties of man, man not there, ii. 439  
 We may be propitiators of God, ii. 667, Iontif. R.  
 First reference to the pyx in ivory, i. 416, 417  
*προσέχων μὴ παραπολέσῃς τι*, i. 189, Cyr. J.  
*ἀγει τὰς παρασκευὰς*, i. 86, Origen  
*Πνεύματος ἁγίου παρουσίαν καὶ ἐπιφύττησιν*, i. 421, Euseb. Alex.  
*τὴν ἑνσαρκον τοῦ Χριστοῦ παρουσίαν*, i. 163, Euseb. C.  
*τὰ παστοφόρια*, i. 137, Ps. Clem.  
*τὴν ἑορτὴν τοῦ πάσχα (Easter)*, i. 430, Socrat., and 431, Soz.  
*ἐποίησε τὸ πάσχα*, i. 113, Hip.  
*ταυτὸν σοι τὸ πάσχα μυστήριον*, i. 214, Greg. Naz.  
*τὸ πάσχα τὸ Ἰουδαϊκὸν ἔφαγεν κ.τ.λ.*, i. 300, Epiph.  
*τὸ Κυρίου πάσχα*, i. 31, Let. Diog.  
*περίγραπτόν ἢ ἀπερίγραπτον*; i. 570, Niceph. Const.  
*Αὐτὸς ὁ Χριστὸς περιφερδμένος*, i. 505, Anast. S.  
*περιγεγραμμένον οἶδεν...καὶ ἁμαρτιῶν καθ-αίρεται*, i. 572, Niceph. Const.

## P. π. φ. ψ.

*οὔτε ἐκ τοῦ φάγειν περισσεύομεν ἀγαθῶ-τιν*, i. 99, Origen  
*συστάνας τοῖς πιστοῖς εἰς δέσιν* (after third year), i. 196, Bas.  
*πᾶς πικρίδων*, i. 168, Euseb. C.  
*ἀνενδοιάστω πιστεῖ*, i. 188, Cyr. J.  
*πνευματικῶς ἐν ἐκάστῳ ἀναδιδόσθαι*, i. 156, Ath.  
*κατὰπεμψόν τὸ Πνεῦμά Σου τὸ ἅγιον*, i. 359, Duc.  
*ἀδιστάκτου πίστεως*, i. 561, J. of D., and 576, Theod. Stu.  
*πιστεύω*, three times, i. 219, Greg. Na.  
*πνευματικὸν ὄντας γονεῖς*, i. 139, Ps. Clem.  
*τὸ Πνεῦμα διαπέμπον*, i. 125, G. Th.  
*καταπέμψῃς τὸ Πνεῦμα*, i. 136, Ps. Clem.  
*ποιέω*, when should be rendered sacrifice, ii. 723, 4, Marr.  
*πολυθεία κερδάτῃ*, i. 197, Bas.  
*πολυποκοῦντα*, i. 158, Ath.  
*τὸ ἐν ποτηρίῳ, τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς πλευρᾶς ρεῦσαν*, i. 562, J. of D.  
*τοῦ ποτηρίου εἰς ἀνάμνησιν*, κ.τ.λ., i. 45 and 47, Just.  
*πρεσβυτικῶς βακτηριεύοντες*, i. 214, Greg. Naz.  
*πρεσβύτεροι οἱ προστάντες τῆς ἐκκλησίας*, i. 161, Euseb. C.  
*τῷ προστώτῳ τῶν ἀδελφῶν*, i. 43 and 45 (Just.), see i. 72, Tert.  
*τὴν τῶν προηγιασμένων τελετὴν*, i. 575, Theod. Stu.  
*ἡ ἅγια πρόθεσις ὁ Κρανίου Τόπος*, i. 540, Sophron.  
*καὶ προκέτῃται ἡ φρικτὴ θυσία*, i. 345, Chrysost.  
*ποιῶν τὰ προκείμενα γενέσθαι σῶμα*, i. 335, Chrysost.  
*προναοὶ with statues*, i. 131, Dion. A.  
 Three bowings to the statue of Christ and Mary, *προσκυνήματα*, i. 355, Duc.  
*οὐ κτίσμα προσκυνούμεν*, i. 154, Ath.  
*προσφερομένην ἀναιμακτων θυσίαν*, i. 325, Amphil.  
*προσφερόμεν Σοι τὴν λογικὴν καὶ ἀναιμακτον λατρείαν*, i. 359, Duc.  
*μεμνημένοι προσφερόμεν*, Ancient Lit., ii. 617, Bull.  
*ἡ μυστικὴ δὲ τῆς προσφορᾶς ὑπὸ τοῦ ιερῆως*, κ.τ.λ., i. 322, Mac.  
*ἡ προσφορὰ ἡ αὐτὴ ἣν ὁ Χριστὸς ἔδωκε καὶ οἱ ιερεῖς ποιούσιν*, i. 340, Chrysost.  
*ἡ προσφορὰ, ἐξ ἧς τὸ Κυριακὸν σῶμα διατέμνεται*, i. 552, Germ. Const.  
 Properly προσφορὰ, improperly θυσία, ii. 536, Mede  
*διδότω τὴν προσφορὰν*, i. 137, Ps. Clem.  
*νέαν προσφορὰν*, i. 56, Iren.  
*ἡ προσφορὰ τῆς εὐχαριστίας*, i. 57, Iren.  
*τὴν προσφορὰν τελέσαντες*, i. 57, Iren.  
*προσφορὰς καὶ λειτουργίας*, i. 15, Clem. R.

## P. π. φ. ψ.

οὐδὲ τὸ πῦρ μυρίας ὑφάπτων λαμπάδας  
μαραίνεται, i. 222, Cæs.  
μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου καὶ φρίκης, i. 318,  
319, Eph. S.  
τῆς μίας φύσεως μὴ οὐσης παθητῆς, i. 569,  
Niceph. Const.  
1 Cor. xi. 20, *σῆπτὰ καὶ φρικτὰ μ.*, i. 563,  
J. of D.  
φρικωδέστατος, i. 185 and 187, Cyr. J.  
δουλος φρικτῆ καὶ σωτήριος, i. 333, Chryst.  
τῆς ἀγίας ἐκείνης καὶ φρικώδους σαρκός, i.  
336, Chrysost.  
ψιλὸν ἄρτον—μετὰ δὲ τὰς φοβεράς ἐπικλή-  
σεις, i. 447, Nil.  
σώμα ἀληθινὸν ἢ ψιλὸς ἄρτος, i. 502,  
Anast. S.  
μὴ ὡς ψιλῶ τῷ μυστικῶ, i. 449, Nil.  
De pane quia et potest et promisit, &c.,  
i. 424, Gaud.  
Cœlesti pane, i. 121, Cyp.  
Internum hominem superno pane pascis,  
i. 438, Eucher.  
Panem cuius ipsum corpus antitypum,  
i. 391, Nest.  
Panem cœlestem de mysteriis, i. 289,  
Jer.  
Non panem illum visibilem, &c., i. 101,  
Origen  
Panem angelorum, i. 286, Jer.  
In panem immigrat. The body born,  
&c., &c., ii. 292, Luth.  
Panem apud pistorem, non in sacram.  
altaris, ii. 212, J. of Prague  
Panem de cœlo vivum offerre, ii. 108,  
S. Bern.  
Non verus panis, Futuri umbra, i. 235,  
Amb.  
Panes non valde grandes nec exiguas, i.  
616, Rab.  
Sancti Sp. consecrationem panis et vini,  
&c., i. 591, Ps. Is. D.  
Panis ante verba, &c., i. 238, Amb.  
Ille panis qui per sacerdotis ministerium  
Chr. c., i. 606, Bert.  
Detur in specie panis, ii. 93, H. de St V.  
Sub velamento corporei panis spirituale  
corpus, i. 607, Bert.  
Mysticus panis, i. 126, Mac. M.  
Propter periculum effus. sang. sub panis  
specie, ii. 217, Gers.  
Non ibi substantia panis et vini, ii. 94,  
H. de St V.  
Panis in Christi corpus transponitur, i.  
608, Bert.  
Sub quinque panibus quinque libri legis,  
i. 175, Hil. P.  
Nunc participamus Jesum per fidem, i.  
603, Scot.  
In futuro participamus per speciem, i.  
603, Scot.  
Per eadem Divinæ participes naturæ, i.  
477, Gelas. I.

## P. π. φ. ψ.

Quinquepartito sensui hordeaceus pa-  
nis, i. 601, Scot.  
Participatione fruimur, omnino vivifica-  
mur, i. 445, Cyr. A.  
Solemnibus Paschæ abnoctantem, i. 80,  
Tert.  
Die paschæ...jejunii religio, i. 80, Tert.  
Passionem Illius reparari credite, i. 628,  
Hink.  
Eorum perceptione expiemur, i. 509,  
Greg. I.  
Poculum ad omnes æque pertinens, ii.  
286, Eras.  
Sacrif. placativum. Sacerdotium (1 Pet.  
ii.), ii. 152, Bonav.  
Præpositi (bishops), i. 116, Cyp.  
Christus a nobis corpore præsens non  
habetur, ii. 365, P. Mart.  
Non sine certissima rei significatione præ-  
sentia, ii. 440, Hosp.  
Nec congregatis homo est præsens, &c.,  
i. 101, Origen  
Secundum præsentiam Majestatis sem-  
per habemus, i. 278, Aug.  
Contemplatione velut præsentem, ii. 312,  
Zwin.  
Custodia seu tabernaculum, processio-  
naliter deferunt, i. 641, Ortiz.  
Hæc commemoratio sola propitium facit,  
i. 92, Origen  
Cur non sub propriâ, ii. 93, H. de St V.  
Per imaginem propriæ passionis, i. 424,  
Gaud.  
In pyxide positum in die cœnæ, &c., ii.  
216, Gers.

## Q.

The qualities and quantities without the  
substance, ii. 479, H. S.  
Quando quibus et quantum oportet, i.  
96, Or.  
Quartodecimanism, i. 523, Isid. Sev.  
Non ulla res adeo ad quæstum, ii. 150,  
Melancthon

## R. ρ.

Raban Maur, a disciple of Alcuin at  
Tours, i. 612  
Winkel in the Rheingau was Raban's  
place of residence, i. 612  
Raban held four sacraments, bread and  
wine, and baptism, and confirmation  
(chrism), i. 612  
Five reasons why under another form,  
ii. 170, W. Dur.  
Bp Heber's remarkable protest against  
J. T.'s misuse of "real," ii. 318  
Not eat and drink real body and blood  
of Christ, ii. 629, Bev.

## B. ρ.

Words true and real, ii. 318. See Heber, Life J. T. (clearest of all)  
 The word "real," as introduced, is unmeaning or worse, &c., ii. 579, B. Heber  
 With sacrament in this sense the term "real" is utterly inconsistent, ii. 578, B. Heber  
 To drink real blood in remembrance of real blood, ii. 676, Hoad.  
 Real, because not feigned, but true and faithful, ii. 319, Hugh Lat.  
 As bread and wine not real body and blood, no sacrifice, ii. 675, Water.  
 Its true and real nature is to appease God's wrath, &c., ii. 540, Cosin  
 We hold not a true real proper and propitiatory sacrifice, *toties quoties*, ii. 540, Cosin  
 Peter a deacon, "When get to reality?" ii. 25, Bereng.  
 Caprera uses realiter of *res ipsa*, the body, ii. 498  
 Must come back to this, Christ gave in true reality, &c., ii. 458, Sarav.  
 Really and truly, not carnally, &c., but mystically and supernaturally, ii. 547, Reyn.  
 These elements changed spiritually in nature, not really but in use, ii. 510, Usher  
 Eating His flesh really, &c., contrary to the Word of God, ii. 359, Hoop.  
 If not His own body veritably and really, why so obscure? ii. 623, 4, Quesnel  
 Lutherans; truly and really present in, with or under, ii. 615, Limb.  
 I cannot understand really and substantially but corporally, ii. 478, H. S.  
 Nor can we really receive, but only benefits, ii. 673, Water.  
 If Christ were really there what the effect, ii. 376, Haus.  
 Spiritually and really but not corporeally, Overall a hundred times, ii. 540, Cosin  
 The words "really and truly" add not to sense, ii. 703, Thirl.  
 The blood, as long as religion, really present, &c., ii. 623, Quesn.  
 Differences of those that recanted, ii. 22  
 "I have received Thee, O God," T. Aquinas dying, ii. 161  
 A bad man receives, ii. 14, Damiani  
 Receptionism, i. 554, J. of D.  
 Reformation, firm belief in number, of visible acts, ii. 238, Ullm.  
 "For My remembrance," or in "commemoration of Me," ii. 612, Barr.  
 Remission joined to blood, express figure of death, ii. 526, Jansen  
 Remission of sins by another man's act not possible, ii. 306, Melanc.

## R. ρ.

A representation of the passion to God, ii. 559, Hamm.  
 Epiphanius says no change in Christ at resurrection, i. 299, Epiph.  
 Review of success of Dr Pusey, ii. 690, Haag  
 Review of Continental Reformation divines, ii. 689, 690, Haag  
 Multitude of sins spring from profanation of this rite, ii. 309, Melan.  
*ἑβραϊστικῶς καὶ κερηρωμένοι*, i. 126, Mac. M.  
 Undecim rationes, eleven explanations, ii. 169, 170, W. Dur.  
 Quod per essentiam aut realiter, &c., we oppose constantly, ii. 312, 13, Zwin.  
 Aliter ad regnum non perveniri, i. 234, Amb.  
 Reliquarium sub tribus seris et januis, i. 641, B. O. Tol.  
 Remedium salutiferum Chr. c. contra peccatum, i. 626, P. Nic. I.  
 (Manichean) corp. *i. e.* quaedam represent. c. Mei, ii. 113, Pet. Cant.  
 "Res sacramenti" and "realiter," ii. 422, Cajetan  
 Ritus promissionis quæ est gratuita, ii. 304, Melanc.

## S. σ.

Sacerdotal imperialism shooting up with Leo I., i. 466  
 Not necessary to a sacrament that thing signified be absent, ii. 426, Mald.  
 In the sacrament the very true and natural, &c., ii. 336, Ridl.  
 The good with weak and wicked united in same sacrament, ii. 622, Quesn.  
 Nothing but this sacram. ever so vilely contaminated and abused, ii. 585, Owen  
 Sacraments not contain the grace by or with them bestowed, ii. 453, Hooker  
 Refuting Aquinas, who put supernatural virtue in sacrament, ii. 175, Duns  
 Christ takes parts of Jewish sacrament to make His own, ii. 551, Light.  
 Practical depraving of both sacraments, ii. 446—9, Rain.  
 Lovely picture of sacramental call to men, ii. 248, Tynd.  
 The church no lady or mistress over sacrament, ii. 388, Bullin.  
 The sacrament a description of His passion to come, ii. 249, Tynd.  
 J. T. said symbols changed after a sacramental, *i. e.* a spiritual, real manner, ii. 578  
 Sacrament ordained to be explained and instruct through our senses, ii. 483, 4, Whitaker  
 Why sacrament not in Apostles' Creed, ii. 177, Duns

S. σ.

His Son's sacrifice in this sacrament represented, ii. 617, Bull  
 How Christian sacraments differ from those of Jews? Accidentally, ii. 535, Owen  
 On word sacrament, ii. 288, Eras.  
 Arguments from the holy sac., ii. 435, Bellarm.  
 Parallel between Christ's natural and sacramental bodies, ii. 662, Johnson  
 Always to be wished to have a sermon before sacrament, ii. 495, Willett  
 Whether eating sacrament necessarily saving, ii. 275, D. de St P.  
 Denial that sacramental body, &c., is Christ Himself, &c., &c., ii. 705, Thirl.  
 Sacramentalism as to baptism and the Lord's supper, ii. 721, 2, Jacob  
 Properly no sacrifice, a sacrament and memorial, ii. 248, Tynd.  
 Definition of a sacrament, ii. 673, Water.  
 Like Jovinian to believe sacrament good out of the church, ii. 36, Humb.  
 None hold that sacrament not a way to get grace of God, ii. 358  
 The remission of sins a part of the sacrament, ii. 457, Sarav.  
 Definition of sacrament (different from Bellarmine), ii. 682, Moehl.  
 He unites Himself with all in this sacrament, ii. 683, Moehl.  
 Sacrament maketh no concord, &c., confirmeth, ii. 359, Hoop.  
 If righteousness from sacrament, Christ died in vain, ii. 356, W. Musc.  
 Bellarmine cited, that flesh in sacrament different from flesh in Heaven, ii. 767, Thirl.  
 Three parts in a sacrament (as Saravia and the two Archdeacons, Wilb. and Denison), ii. 698  
 Sacraments, which are as visible words, J. Taylor's words, ii. 533  
 Not startle at difficulty of sacramental change, &c., ii. 637, Comb.  
 Substantialiter may be a substantial sacrament, i.e. really, truly, ii. 577, J. Tay.  
 This sacrament a visible word, preaching peace, ii. 359, Honius  
 Sacrament takes away all consent to great sins, ii. 106, St Bern.  
 Signs belonging to Divine things are sacraments, ii. 611, Barr.  
 The sacrament and not the sacrifice, ii. 399, Geste  
 Sacrament bare and empty of Christ's body, not of blessing, ii. 320  
 When sacrament dealt, none crouched, or took it for God, ii. 400, Grind.

S. σ.

Why the idea that this sacrament is a sacrifice has been ever continually recurring, i. 8  
 Without this sacrament rest of Christ's work insufficient, ii. 683, Moehl.  
 The sacred sign testifies the presence of the thing signified, ii. 455, Sarav.  
 Called sacrifice by ancients, Judaizing, ii. 529, Calixt.  
 This kind of sacrifice falsely assigned, &c., not a sacrifice, ii. 484, Arm.  
 If elements a sacrifice, then sin offering and propitiation. Scripture says not, ii. 675, Waterl.  
 People to kill sacrifice generally, clearly kill passover, ii. 555, Cudw.  
 Bellarmine pleads that thing sacrificed is destined to alteration, &c., ii. 451, R. Abb.  
 Called a sacrifice because commemorative of the Sacrifice, ii. 161, T. Aquin.  
 Definition of a proper sacrifice, ii. 531, Calixt.  
 Unbloody sacrifice true sacrifice if appeases God, ii. 429, Mald.  
 That lurching sacrifice of the mass, when people receive not, ii. 535, Mede  
 To a true sacrifice, the death or destroying of thing sacrificed, ii. 451, R. Abb.  
 The sacrifice, ii. 3, Ælif.  
 If we think the sacrifice on cross insufficient, &c., ii. 637, Comb.  
 Eight or nine different modes of a sacrifice, ii. 428, Mald.  
 Christ spake never a word of sacrificing, ii. 319, Hugh Lat.  
 May be called a sacrifice for any harm I know, &c., ii. 540, Cosin  
 (1) Not true and proper sacrifice, (2) not to be adored, ii. 502, Crak.  
 Expiatory sacrifice soon accepted, ii. 684, Haag  
 Protestants answer, Christ the church's sacrifice, ii. 674, Water.  
 Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving and a commemoration, &c., ii. 538, Bram.  
 Definition of proper propitiatory sacrifice. Such Christ on cross only, ii. 502, Crak.  
 Early Christians given way to sacrifice God-man, ii. 237, Ullm.  
 Christ as a sacrifice alone answers to Jewish priest, ii. 677, Hoad.  
 Fathers call it a sacrifice, and then say not, ii. 677, Hoad.  
 The devil evacuates Christ's death by sacrifice propitiatory, ii. 320, 1, Hugh L.  
 Why apostles not mention sacrifice, ii. 319, Hugh Lat.  
 Why make ye of Him more sacrifices than one? semel, &c., ii. 321, Hugh Lat.



## S. σ.

Satan fears the recipients, i. 377, Cyr. A.  
 The Saviour's Divine matter impregnates soul, ii. 683, Moehl.  
 That might save every man who becomes Him in sacram., ii. 535, Mede  
 Bramhall near to Scripture on this sacrament, ii. 537  
 Nothing to be admitted from Scripture which opposes this, ii. 505, Thorn.  
 Scripture (*i.e.* its interpretation) to be confined within these bounds, ii. 505, Thorn.  
 A sealed pardon, ii. 653, Baxt.  
 The ring and seal of Christ's promise, and a perpetual memorial, ii. 480, H. S.  
 Comparison of a ship at sea and a ship in the mind, ii. 453, Hooker  
 Frequent separation of affection and imagination from judgment, ii. 620, I. Amb.  
 To-morrow shed, which ye now drink, ii. 82, B. of Seg.  
 Silence in the Acts, and all Epistles but one, ii. 719, H. Seym.  
 Relation of sinner to God direct, ii. 240, Wesel  
 Something added (letter, 1875), i. 572  
 Arians, Socinians, and orthodox nonconformists say spiritual benefit, ii. 675  
 A human spirit and any limited being not in two places, ii. 660  
 That the Spirit may make this, &c., &c., ii. 662, Wilson  
 Hoadley ignores, not denies, spiritual benefit, ii. 675  
 The use of the small spoon, ii. 725, Scudam.  
 Styed for ascended, ii. 203, Wye.  
 Subordination of Persons consistent with coequality, ii. 616, Bull  
 Subordination of the church to the Bishop, as of Christ to the Father, i. 28, Ignat.  
 Substance able to give life, ii. 329, Ridl.  
 Terms substance and accidents sufficiently correct, ii. 737  
 Two ways, virtually. Substance there, and substance not there, ii. 736  
 The substance entirely contained under one kind, ii. 591, Outr.  
 Dr Neale on substance and accidents, ii. 734, Capel, and 737  
 Nowhere read substance of sign made void, ii. 387, Bullin.  
 A summary word, ii. 698  
 The shewbread a type of the Lord's supper, i. 376, Cyr. A.  
 Where—to take the Lord's supper alone? ii. 399, Geste  
 We receive not literally but symbolically, ii. 672, Waterl.

## S. σ.

ἡ σὰρξ οὐ κατήλθεν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, i. 181, Euseb. Em.  
 τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς, i. 86, Origen  
 συνδοξασθείσης τῆς σαρκὸς Αὐτοῦ, i. 559, J. of D.  
 ἡ σὰρξ, τοῦτεστιν ἡ κοινὴ καὶ ψιλή, οὐκ ὠφέλει (John vi.), i. 449, Nil.  
 ἐμπῆσαι τοὺς ὀδόντας τῇ σαρκί, i. 342, Chrysost.  
 εἰς ἐκείνην ἐγκερασθῶμεν τὴν σάρκα, i. 342, Chrysost.  
 σάρκα δρέγει, κ.τ.λ., i. 61, Clem. A.  
 τῶν Σεραφίμ κραζόντων τρόμφ, i. 338, Chrysost.  
 βαστάζειν ἐν σκευοφορίᾳ ἀπερχόμενον, i. 505, Anast. S.  
 σταυροειδῶς τὰς παλάμας τυπώσαντες, κ.τ.λ., i. 561, J. of D.  
 περὶ τοῦ τυπικοῦ καὶ συμβολικοῦ σώματος, i. 100, Origen  
 ἐν ταῖς συνάξεσιν ἀκηκόατε, i. 187, Cyr. J.  
 εἰ τελείται σύναξις... πᾶσαν ἡμέραν, i. 450, Nil.  
 ἐκ τοῦ κυριωτέρου μέρους συνεκδοχικῶς τὸ δλον, i. 574, Theod. Stu.  
 ἐν ταύτῃ, in Lent, συνεσκιασμένως, i. 575, Theod. Stu.  
 παρεκαινοτόμησε τὴν σύστασιν, i. 206 and 209, Greg. Ny.  
 εἰς πᾶσάν σου τὴν σύστασιν ἀναδίδοται, i. 188, Cyr. J.  
 ἐπισφραγίζεται, i. 165, Euseb. C.  
 σῶμα σιτουμένων Δεσποτικόν, i. 339, Chrysost.  
 ἔχομεν Χριστὸν, τὸ σῶμα Αὐτοῦ, i. 163, Euseb. C.  
 τοῦ τιμίου σώματος ἀπολαύσωσιν, i. 421, Euseb. Alex.  
 τῇ ἐπαφῇ τοῦ ἀγίου σώματος, i. 189, Cyr. J.  
 ἀνέμιξε καὶ ἀνέφυρε τὸ σῶμα εἰς ἡμᾶς, i. 342, Chrysost.  
 οὐ μὴν αὐτὸ τὸ σῶμα νλὸς ἀνθρώπου, ὡς Μάρκελλος, i. 519, Ammon.  
 σῶμα προσενήχεθαι Θεῷ, i. 163, Euseb. C.  
 μὴ κατανεμέτω τὸ σῶμα, i. 195, Bas.  
 κατάνευρον (σῶμα), i. 222, Cæss.  
 γένηται εἰς τὸ ἅγιον σῶμά Σου, i. 218, Greg. Naz.  
 οὕτω τὸ σῶμα τὸ ἡμέτερον γίνεται, i. 450, Nil.  
 σωματικῆς μὲν τροφῆς, πνευματικῆς δὲ καὶ ὑπερβαλλούσης, i. 338, Chrysost.  
 τὴν χορτῆγιαν τοῦ σώματος, i. 449, Nil.  
 τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Ἀντρωτοῦ, i. 513, Greg. I.  
 τὸν Σωτῆρα ἐνστερνίσασθαι, i. 61, Clem. A.  
 Sacerdos, sacrum dans, i. 528, Isid. Sev.  
 Quilibet ex sacerdotali catalogo, i. 588, Ps. Is. D.  
 Sacerdos missam solus non celebret, reason given, i. 581, Theodulf

## S. σ.

Pudicitia sacerdotalis, i. 294, Jer.  
 Pro nobis sacerdos et sacrificium, i. 255, Aug.  
 Sacerdotes efficiunt ex sensibili materia hanc visibilem, i. 603, Scot.  
 Sacerdotii dignitate ut eis in cunctis obediant, i. 583, Agob.  
 Officio sacerdotii nostri, i. 119, Cyp.  
 Sacram. testes et fœdera. Deus consignavit, ii. 271, Colet  
 Non est in sacram. aliqua virtus quæ, &c., i. 163, T. Aquin.  
 Sacram. quotid. ecclesiæ sacrificium, i. 269, Aug.  
 Sacram. vas omnis gratiæ, ii. 158, Alb. M.  
 Sine ullâ significatione alicujus tecti sacramenti, i. 74, Tert.  
 Adesse sed sacramentaliter, &c., ii. 313, Zwin.  
 Tantummodo sacram. non res sacram., ii. 106, S. Bern.  
 Sub specie prop. in cœlo: sub specie sacram. in alt., ii. 215, Gest.  
 Vis (sacram.) non augetur vel dim., ii. 122, Alan.  
 Non solum sacram. tenuis, ut Bereng., ii. 109, Gers.  
 Res sacram. gratia, qua unitur Christo, ii. 211, Hus.  
 Sacramenta non ex se, &c., &c., ii. 384, Buc.  
 A malis tantum sacramentaliter, ii. 117, P. Lomb.  
 A nobis sumendum sacramentaliter, ii. 232, Tost.  
 Aliud sacramentum, aliud virtus sac., i. 275, Aug.  
 Sacramentum fontis et calicis (Joh. xix. 34), i. 485, Fulg.  
 Sac. sacram factum, i. 523, Isid. Sev.  
 Sacramentum concorporationis, i. 173, Hil. P.  
 Sacram. sacram signum (vel) secretum, ii. 105, S. Bern.  
 Deo sacrificia offerre, i. 122, Cyp.  
 Deo sacrificia offerre, i. 149  
 Sacrificantibus nobis, i. 119, Cyp.  
 Against image worship, Illi soli sacrificetur, &c., i. 585, Agob.  
 Sacrificia Dei quotidie, i. 148  
 Sacrificii hujus auctor et doctor, i. 117, Cyp.  
 Sacrificii memoriam oblatione, &c., corporis, &c., i. 268, Aug.  
 In sacrificio corp. Chr. mitti Sp. S., i. 485, Fulg.  
 Quod est de sacrificio sumpturus altaris, i. 481, Fulg.  
 Extra hanc nullum sacrificium, ii. 98, Honor.  
 Sacrificium panis per eucharistiam, i. 305, Syl.

## S. σ.

Hoc sacrificium placat Deum, &c., ii. 171, W. Dur.  
 Ut sacrificium suscipias de manibus, i. 244, Amb.  
 Sanctificata per Sp. S., i. 529, Isid. Sev.  
 Ne hæreas in sanguine, i. 90, Origen  
 Sanguis in oratere ex latere Tuo, i. 307, Syl.  
 Christus aspergit Patrem sang. quoties, &c., ii. 171, W. Dur.  
 In qua quotidie sang. Suum bibit Christus, i. 438, Eucher.  
 Non videtur oculis quod vinum in sang. versum est, i. 614, Rab.  
 Sanguinem e Divino latere accipite, i. 308, Syl.  
 Sanguinem Seipsum probet, i. 568, Paulin. A.  
 Bibere sang. quod lex interdicebat, ii. 135, Cœn. D.  
 Scientibus et ignorantibus, i. 92, Or.  
 Secrete et sub silentio explained, i. 166, W. Dur.  
 Sedet ad dexteram Patris inde venturus, i. 265, Aug.  
 Christum sedere sicut in cœlo, ii. 149, A. Hales  
 Significavit, force of here, i. 242, Amb.  
 Non quod videntur sed quod Divino Sp. facta, i. 608, Bert.  
 Ut immittere digneris Sp. Tuum S., i. 497, Germ. P.  
 Verbis arcanis cum sacro suffitu, i. 498, Germ. P.

## T. τ. θ.

Description of the one very ancient holy table, ii. 691, Lubke  
 This so terrific mystery, i. 49, Anselm  
 Is there a third latent way besides cons. and trans.? ii. 736  
 Erigena's three lines of thought, i. 605  
 Scripture to be explained by tradition, of which the Church the keeper, ii. 644, 5, Leib.  
 No tradition, but only of Scripture, can derive self from Fountain, &c., ii. 549, Chill.  
 Transelemented into Christ, ii. 61, Theophylact  
 Explain assertion, Bread transelemented into body, ii. 350, Jewel; and B. Mant, 364  
 Transform wholly into Himself, by the communication, &c., ii. 273, Colet  
 The bread is transmade by ineffable words, ii. 60, Theophylact  
 Transubstantiation another doctrine from a real presence, ii. 734, Lidd.

## T. τ. θ.

If natural substance of bread no transubstantiation, nor adoration, &c., ii. 333, Ridl.  
 Apostles and successors power to transubstantiate, using set words, ii. 185, 186, Marsil.  
 Transelementation equivalent to transubstantiation, ii. 722, Jacob  
 Transubstantiation the nearest theory to truth except the true, ii. 687  
 Nothing of transubstantiation in Apostles' Creed, ii. 241, Honius  
 Transubstantiation and multipresence, which the worse? ii. 519, Hall  
 M. Capel charges several terms with being transubstantiation, ii. 735  
 Classified summary of arguments for transubstantiation from fathers, ii. 433, Bellarm.  
 Transubstantiation is by the sacred words drawn down, &c., ii. 712, Goulb.  
 What is essentially consubstantiation, and what transubstantiation, ii. 736  
 Singular parallel between doctrine of Eutychius and transubstantiation, ii. 609 and 610, Still.  
 Cardinal Perron and A. Arnauld, best defenders of transubstantiation, ii. 615, Till.  
 All fathers make it dissonant from transubstantiation, ii. 617, Bull  
 Camera said to Luther, easier if Church not held transubstantiation, ii. 294, Luth.  
 The saints hold some conversion, if not transub., ii. 148, A. Hales  
 Council of Trent on transubstantiation, ii. 705, Thirl.  
 Whether words on transubstantiation or consubstantiation in host or in soul not settled, ii. 538, Bram.  
 Alternative of evils in transub., ii. 280, D. de St P.  
 In transubstantiation, Christianity external immediate Divine revelation, ii. 684, Moehl.  
 Transubstantiation came in A.D. 750, in argument about images, ii. 614  
 Aug. v. Amb., mode of transub., ii. 129, Innoc. III.  
 If it be Christ's natural body, transubstantiation, &c., and adoration, &c., ii. 333, Ridl.  
 Denied that a trope is any way admissible, ii. 561, Eckh.  
 Jumble heaven and earth rather than hold one tropical speech, ii. 520, Hall  
 Words to be tropically received, ii. 86, P. Mart.  
 On Tropologia and Anagoge, i. 438, St Eucher.

## T. τ. θ.

Tropical speaking, ii. 26, Bereng.  
 If bread turned into Christ then two Christs, ii. 512, Ussher  
 ὑπὸ τῶν ἀξίων τέλειαι μόναι, i. 45, Just.  
 τὸ τέλειον, i. 146  
 τῇ τοιαύτῃ θείᾳ τελετῇ, i. 435, Procl.  
 διατέμνει σιδήρῳ τινι, i. 553, Germ. Const.  
 θανάτου ἐξουσίαν ἐλήφασιν, i. 139, Pa. Clem.  
 Θεοτόκος, Θεομήτωρ, &c., ii. 109  
 Note on Θεουργία, &c., by the Jesuit Corder, i. 494  
 τὸ θῆλυ ἡ ἐκκλησία, i. 22, Pseudo-Clem. R.  
 τῷ θιάσῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων, i. 221, Cæs.  
 περὶ τῆς θείας τραπέζης, κ.τ.λ., i. 472, Gelas. Cyz.  
 Χριστὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἱερᾶς τραπέζης ἀνακεκμενον, i. 421, Euseb. Al.  
 αὐτῇ ἡ τράπεζα τῆς ψυχῆς τὰ νεῦρα, i. 344, Chrysost.  
 τὰ σεμνὰ τῆς Χριστοῦ τραπέζης θύματα, i. 164, Euseb. C.  
 Θεοῦ τρίχα τὴν Χριστοῦ, κ.τ.λ., i. 222 Cæs.  
 θυμῶν τοὺς τάφους καὶ ἀγίους, i. 131, Dion. A.  
 ὁ τύπος σωτήριος, i. 379, Cyr. A.  
 Not πάσχα θύσιμον, but μνημονευτικόν, Grotius, ii. 555, Cudw.  
 θεωρία ἡ θυσία, i. 164, Euseb. C.  
 ἄγγελος ἔθυσε τὸ παιδίον, i. 330, Pallad.  
 ἀπὸ νηοτικῶν προσάγεσθαι θυσίας, i. 634, Phot.  
 Αὕτη μόνῃ ἡ θυσία σώζει, i. 512, Greg. I.  
 εἰ ἄλλο ἢν ἐκείνο, καὶ ἄλλο τοῦτο...οὐ θυσία, Heb. vii., i. 557, J. of D.  
 It is a λογικὴ θυσία (sacrifice of the mind, properly reason), ii. 617, Bull  
 τῆς θυσίας ἐκείνης τοῦ Ἰλασμοῦ, i. 187 and 189, Cyr. J.  
 θυσία Θεῷ, Ps. li., i. 195, Bas.  
 ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν, i. 49, Theoph., and λογικὴ λατρεία, &c., i. 94, Origen  
 θυσιαστήριον ἀναίμακτον καὶ λογικῶν θυσιών, i. 165, Euseb. C.  
 ἀξιάγαστον θυσιαστήριον, i. 372, Cyr. A.  
 ἡ μυστικὴ καὶ ἀναίμακτος θυσία, i. 550, Germ. Const.  
 ἡ τοῦ Πνεύματος χάρις κατασκευάζει θυσίαν, i. 339, Chrysost.  
 τῆς ἱερᾶς ταύτης ἀπώμεθα τῆς θυσίας, i. 338, Chrysost.  
 προσδέξαι τὴν θυσίαν ἐς τὸ οὐρανίον σου θυσιαστήριον, i. 358, Duc.  
 ἀνελλειπῶς ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ θυσίαν, i. 513, Greg. I.  
 ἀναιμάκτους θυσίας, i. 377, Cyr. A.  
 θυσίας ἀναιμάκτους — ἀνάμνησιν, ii. 67, Theophylact  
 τῆς θυσίας τὸ λείψανον, i. 374, Cyr. A.

## T. τ. θ.

θυσίαις σωματικαῖς κεχρημένος, i. 165, Euseb. C.  
 θυσίας αλέσεως (Ps. xci.), i. 161, Euseb. C.  
 τραπέζαν τὸ ἅγιον θυσιαστήριον, i. 154, Ath.  
 θυσιαστήριον κατὰ τὸ νοερόν καὶ ἐπουράνιον, i. 552, Germ. Const.  
 τῷ σεπτῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ, i. 454 and 455, Isid. Pel.  
 τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου, and ἄρτος Θεοῦ, i. 25, and see 26, Ignat.  
 τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ προσπίπτει, i. 212, Greg. Na.  
 εὐχὴν λέραν ἐπὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ θυσιαστ. τελέσας, i. 493, Dionys.  
 Αὐτὸν καὶ Θεὸν νοεῖσθαι θυσιαστήριον, i. 874, Cyr. A.  
 τὰ θυσιαστήρια τῆς πνευματικῆς λατρείας, i. 197, Bas.  
 οἱ ἱερεῖς τῷ ἁγίῳ θυσιαστ. προσεδρεύοντες, i. 533, Germ. Const.  
 μὴ ἴδῃ τὸν οὐράνιον θυσιαστήριον, i. 320, Eph. S.  
 ἡ μυστικὴ ζωοθυσία γίνεται, i. 550, Germ. Const.  
 ζωοθυτούμενος τὴν σάρκα εἰς βρώσιν, i. 550, Germ. Const.  
 τοῖς πιστοῖς ιεροθυτούμενος δι' ἧς, κ.τ.λ., i. 551, Germ. Const.  
 σὺκ ἔστι τύπος, κ.τ.λ., μὴ γένοιτο, i. 561, J. of D.  
 Tanti tamque terribilis sacramenti, i. 548, Bede  
 Hoc figura testamenti, quod novum appellat, i. 619, Rab.  
 Hoc totum est quia id ipsum est, i. 598, Pasch.  
 Granum tritici resurgens...totum esse (whole Christ), i. 595, Haimo  
 Ille totus sumitur, whole Christ received, ii. 115, P. Lomb.  
 Ut in id quod sumimus transeamus, Col. iii. 3, i. 469, Leo I.  
 Ut in Divinam transeant, S. Sp. perficiente, i. 477, Gelas. I.  
 In carnem transfigurantur, &c., i. 242, Amb.  
 They say at the end of the last syllable, panem transmutare, ii. 446, Par.  
 Transubstantians panem in corp. Suum, ii. 208, Hus.  
 Ad probationem verborum transub., ii. 168, W. Dur.  
 Transubstantiatis, &c., potestate Div., ii. 136, C. L. IV.  
 Neque transubs. nec realis conjunctio, &c., cogitandæ, ii. 414, Beza  
 Transubs., ii. 121, and stultissimum diffiteri, &c., 122, Alan.  
 Verba illa omnino tropice dicta sunt, ii. 366, P. Mart.

## T. τ. θ.

Tuguria circuire, i. 80, Tert.  
 Accipientibus tutela, i. 148

## U. v.

Luther borrowed doctrine of ubiquity of Christ's body from J. F., ii. 626, Limb.  
 Luther gave up ubiquity, and built on words of Christ, ii. 626, Limb.  
 Christ alive undiminished at God's right hand, ii. 18, Lanf.  
 Greeks anathematize users of unleavened, ii. 46, Anselm  
 Dispute which Christ used. Theoph. said unleavened, ii. 59  
 A leaven and an unleaven party in Greek Church after Humbert, ii. 59  
 Eastern says, Throw unleaven, &c., to the Jews, ii. 86, Humb.  
 καταβαίνωμεν εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ, κ.τ.λ., i. 37, Barnab.  
 ὕδατος καὶ κρέματος, i. 43 (Just.), temperamentum calicis, i. 54, Iren.  
 δι' τοῦ χορηγούμενον, i. 125, G. Th.  
 τὸ ὑλικόν, i. 99, Or.  
 ἡ ὑπόστασις (the substance) τοῦ Λόγου, i. 558, J. of D.  
 ὑπωπιάζω, 1 Cor. ix. 27, i. 86, Or.  
 ὑφαλεῖται θάνατον, i. 379, Cyr. A.  
 τοῦ ποιῆσαι τὴν ἁγίαν ὕψωσιν, i. 361, Duo.  
 Ubique, ut Deus, i. 265, Aug.  
 Ei adunabimur per caritatem, i. 603, Scot.  
 Unitatem ecclesiasticam, i. 116, Cyp.  
 Humiliat Se, sicut in uterum virginis, ii. 142, F. of A.  
 Uvæ et frumenta, i. 470, Leo I.

## V.

Against veiling—offered in the truth of reality, ii. 52, Anselm  
 We in the spiritual intention communicate of His very Person, ii. 613, Barr.  
 Giveth the very substance, &c., ii. 259, Cov.  
 So given that we verily receive His body and His blood, ii. 350, Jewel  
 Verity of the body, and true faith of the body, &c., ii. 331, Ridl.  
 Dove-like vessel hanging from the ciborium, ii. 692, Lubke  
 Received her viaticum, the most holy body, &c., i. 632, Ken  
 The Virgin in "a fiery furnace," i. 515, Evag.  
 Virtue issues in the manner that pleases Christ, ii. 696, A. Wilb.  
 Figuræ secundum speciem veram sec. invia. subs. c. and s. Chr. vere, i. 609, Bert.

## V.

In veram transisse substantiam, ii. 76, Rup.  
 Divina et materialis subst. est verbum, ii. 169, W. Dur.  
 Verbum quod nutrit, &c., i. 101, Origen  
 Vere nobis exhiberi non secus ac, &c., &c., ii. 338, Calv.  
 Christum vere in hoc sacrificio exhiberi, i. 498, Germ. P.  
 Vere substantialiter adesse Christum, ii. 308, Augsb. Conf.  
 Si, quod sumitur, in ipsa veritate spiritaliter, &c., i. 280, Aug.  
 Vere et spiritualiter—hoc est fide, non proprie adesse, ii. 364, P. Mart.  
 True body of Christ truly, reversa, contained, ii. 353, Jan. of G.  
 De vere et proprie dicta carne, ii. 353, Jan. of G.  
 Viaticum postulare, i. 459, and 460, Chrysol.  
 Seipsum in hac vita viaticum, &c., ii. 84, P. of B.  
 Vini intinctum (dipped), ii. 96  
 Substantiarum panis et vini natura conversa, i. 594, Haimo  
 Virtute Spiritus in verbo efficitur, i. 597, Pasch.  
 Viscerum nostrorum sanctificent interna, i. 425, Gaud.  
 Si non particip. mundatus non venire ad vitam, i. 476, Gelas. I.  
 Eos vivere, John vi., i. 121, Cyp.  
 Vivificum corpus per veram unionem, i. 444, Cyr. A.  
 Sic voluit Ille Qui creavit, i. 596, Pasch.

## W.

The benefits, the washing away of sins, ii. 559, Hamm.  
 Opposes mixing water, and any breaking of the body, ii. 101, Ab.  
 Though not in Gospels, water with wine, ii. 218, Gers.  
 Argued, water not to be mixed with the wine, ii. 277, D. de St P.  
 On the addition of water to the wine, ii. 531, 2, Calixt.  
 Water mixed with wine, blood only, ii. 83, P. of B.  
 White v. black, i. 429, Soc.  
 Wine and water, i. 264, Aug.  
 If wine, why not unleaven, ii. 37, Humb.

## W.

By wine the Deity, by water the manhood, ii. 97, Honor.  
 Scraping the earth on which the wine falls, i. 442, Rab.  
 Our union with Christ, why water with wine, i. 547, Bede  
 The woman that touched Christ's robe, (Matt. ix.), i. 275, Aug.  
 A special kind of worship, ii. 638, Leib. (peculiar promise of grace)  
 Seven gradations of worship (sacrifice), from Peter, i. 529, Isid. Sev.  
 Sore abused, worshipped contrary to command., ii. 478, H. S.  
 You may be worshipping a non-ens, ii. 658, Wake  
 Christians always worshipping God immediately, not by ordinance, ii. 621, I. Amb.

## Z. ζ.

Will this precipitate us into Zuinglian-ism? ii. 656, Wake  
 τὴν ἀναμάρτητον καὶ ζωεὶν, ii. 65, Theophylact  
 ὡς αὐτός ἐστι ζωὴ, οὕτω καὶ ἡ ἐνωθεῖσα αὐτῷ σὰρξ, κ.τ.λ., i. 520, Ammon.  
 ζῶν χαριζόμενον, i. 154, Athan.  
 πρὸς καὶνότητα ζωῆς ἀναστοιχειούμενοι, i. 381, Cyr. A.  
 φυλακτήριον εἰς ζῶν αἰώνιον, i. 156, Athan.  
 ὅλον ἐξ ὅλου τὸ ζῶν εἰς ζῶν ἀναπλάττων, i. 518, Ammon.  
 ζωοποιεῖ τοὺς νεκρωθέντας ἐν παραπτώμασιν, i. 449, Nil.  
 ζωοποιεῖ τὸ δῆγιον σῶμα τοὺς ἐν οἷς ἀν γένοίτο, i. 383, Cyr. A.  
 τῆς ζωοποιου κοινωνίας μὴ ἀποκωλυθῆναι, i. 633, Phot.  
 ὅλον σπέρμα ζωοποιὸν τὸ σῶμα τῆς ζωῆς, i. 382 and 383, Cyr. A.  
 χορηγὸν τῆς ζωοποιου τροφῆς, i. 167, Euseb. C.  
 ἀχραντος and ζωοποιός used of both the Spirit and the supper, i. 142  
 τὸ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Ἀθῆου σῶμα ζωοποιὸν ἐστίν, i. 385, Cyr. A.  
 πνεῦμα ζωοποιὸν ἢ σὰρξ, διότι ἐκ ζωοποιου II. συνελήφθη, i. 562, J. of D.  
 ἤρωται (ἡ σὰρξ Χριστοῦ) τῷ ζωοποιούντι Ἀδῶψ, i. 384, Cyr. A.

# THIRD INDEX. OF HISTORICAL AND OTHER FACTS.

This index also is regulated by the leading words, but they are more frequently the names of a person or a place.

## A.

Abailard conquers William of Champeaux and all: then falls, ii. 100  
 Abailard's writings against infidelity, ii. 100  
 St Bernard loses in conquering Abailard, ii. 99  
 Dr Robert Abbot worthy to be set with Jewel and Bilson, ii. 450  
 Ægyppius extracted 352 heads of doctrine from Augustine, i. 520  
 Æneas Sylvius present on all great occasions, ii. 244  
 Ælfric, his preferment, ii. 1  
 Had Ælfric seen John Scot or Ratram, &c.? ii. 5  
 Agobard when France declined to a silver age, i. 581  
 Alan (Lille) knew all knowable, ii. 118  
 Estimate of Albertus Magnus, ii. 156.  
 Studied Avicenna and Aristotle  
 Albertin on Eucharist, parallel work to Hosp., ii. 542  
 Alcuin sprang from Archb. Hechbert's school, i. 563  
 The violence in Alexandria due to spread of monkery, i. 390  
 Thirst of supremacy in church of Alexandria, i. 341  
 Allusion to Zwingle, ii. 338, Calv.  
 Amalaricus confided in and employed by Charlem., i. 577  
 Ambrose the apostle of perilous opinions, i. 247  
 Amb., Aug., Jer., the Latin triad. Tert. and Cyp. pioneers, i. 231  
 Isaac Ambrose, chaplain to Earl of Bedford, ii. 619  
 Ammonius led astray by great doctors of Cent. iv., i. 519, 520  
 Ammonius said by Anast. S. to be best expositor of Sc., i. 517

## A.

Anastasius of Sinai the new Moses, i. 501  
 Andrew of Crete nearer Chrysostom than Chrysol., i. 541  
 Great Anglican lights following Alfred, Soames' and Migne's opinions, ii. 1, 2, 3  
 Anselm a leader against Roscelin, the nominalist, ii. 42  
 Antioch the school of true breadth of view, i. 394  
 Aquileia, a second Rome, i. 223  
 The party of Arminius with good Barneveldt destroyed, ii. 483  
 Antoine Arnauld writes up infallible Roman Church and yet is exiled, ii. 568  
 A. Arnauld's answer to M. La Noue on frequent com., ii. 563  
 From Ang. Arnauld's appointment to Agnes' death 72 years, ii. 572  
 Arnold of Brescia from Abailard's teaching, ii. 99  
 Parts of Ascham deserve reprinting with parts of others, ii. 343  
 Athanasius, his devotion from Anth., logic from Or., i. 153  
 Augustine's settlement of dates of events of fifth day, i. 259  
 Augustine's wide influence, i. 251  
 Authorities made co-ordinate, Syn. Basle, ii. 466, Rain.  
 Averroes said, If worship the God they eat, he prefers philosophers, ii. 618, Bull  
 Avitus wished forsaken heretical chapels ignored, i. 430  
 Bacon and Hales both used Aristotle, ii. 147  
 Bacon's idea of the failure of (logic) dialectical art, ii. 172

## B.

**Extraordinary fertility of Barrow's mind**, ii. 612  
**Basil and the two Gregories his friends establish the Godhead of the Holy Ghost in Council II.**, i. 190  
**Basil's three distinctions**, i. 192  
**R. Baxter became a Royal Chaplain, but refused to be B. of Hereford**, ii. 652  
**Bede's learning traceable to Theod. Cant. bringing Greek**, i. 545 and 548  
**Bellarmino had portrait of Dr Whitaker in his study**, ii. 443  
**Bellarmino the necessary supplement to Pius IV.'s Catechism**, ii. 430  
**Notice of several Benedicts**, i. 591  
**Did Berengar hear J. Scot's treatise?** ii. 21  
**Berengar's Reply to Lanfranc twice printed**, ii. 23  
**Bernard patron of the M. of Sentences**, ii. 114  
**Bernard and authority. Also the crusade**, ii. 103, 4  
**Bertram's treatise lent by Ridley to Cranmer**, i. 605  
**Beveridge refused to acknowledge Commonwealth and Protectorate**, ii. 628  
**Beza in accomplishments the phoenix of his age**, ii. 410  
**Alcuin gave to Charlemagne a Bible with corrected text**, i. 564  
**Biel, Tonstall and Fisher—troubled**, ii. 474, H. S.  
**Bilney's mournful resolution**, ii. 257  
**Blemmidas' fidelity in this sacrament**, ii. 177, 8  
**A Dr Boileau denies that Bertram's treatise helps Prot.**, i. 606  
**Bonaventure lectured for Franciscans same day as Aquinas for Dom.**, ii. 150  
**Bonaventure wishes to alter order of acts in institution**, ii. 151  
**The change that came on Bossuet in fighting Fenelon**, ii. 592  
**Bossuet satisfied with mere assumptions**, ii. 543, 4, 7  
**John Bradford fruit of Latimer's preaching**, ii. 368  
**Many Brunos for and against Berengar**, ii. 79, 80  
**Bryennius' discoveries in Library of Holy Sepulchre**, i. 20, 21  
**Bucer's funeral at Camb.**, ii. 380  
**Bucer's account of the diff. Luther and Zwingel**, ii. 385  
**Bullinger, successor to Zwingel, received English angels**, ii. 386  
**Cajetan and Luther, and Constable Bourbon**, ii. 421  
**Calixtus most learned adversary we have**, ii. 591, Outr.

## C.

**Calixtus followed Melanc. against Form. Concord**, ii. 528  
**Comparison of Calvin with chiefs in civil rule and religion**, ii. 337  
**Calvin. The body really received, minds rising to Heaven**, ii. 640, Leib.  
**Two isles Lerin near Cannes**, i. 425  
**Issue of the C. L. controversy alien from the point**, ii. 732, 8  
**Reply to Charlemagne about Aug. and Jer.**, i. 564  
**Escape of Prot. from Charles V.**, ii. 259  
**Chemnitz with A. Musc. drew up Formula Concordiæ**, ii. 415  
**At 29 Chillingworth returned home to Oxford from Douai**, ii. 549  
**Chrysologus far beneath Chrysostom**, i. 457  
**Chrysostom truly "incomparable,"** i. 321  
**Chrys. stopped Theod. M. from marrying**, i. 395  
**The mother of Chrys. placed him under Libanius**, i. 333  
**Chunrad Gotteschalk's successor took up Geroch**, ii. 108  
**Cistercians**, ii. 77, 8  
**William Claggett, specially clear on John vi.**, ii. 636  
**Jean Claude, like Claudius at Avranches by Charlemagne**, ii. 602  
**Clement of Rome set the door a little open towards Judaism**, i. 17  
**Panegyric on Clem. V.'s saying and the Lord's supper**, i. 640, F. O. Tol.  
**The fable of S. Clement's martyrdom**, i. 143, Ps. Clem.  
**Clement A. between Pantænus and Origen at St Mark's, Alexandria**, i. 59  
**Clement A. and Origen, several points of likeness**, i. 65 and 66  
**Clement of Rome (on Hefele's hypothesis) made bishop within a year of St Paul's death, and Linus and Anacletus commissaries only, according to Tischendorf**, i. 12  
**Coleridge on Berengar**, ii. 23  
**Colet entered Oxford year after Luther born**, ii. 269  
**Will any but Comber ever write 7 vols. on our Prayer-Book?** ii. 637  
**Cornelius à Lapide, properly Van den Steen**, ii. 486  
**Councils at Ferrara and Florence, last trials to unite E. and W.**, i. 631  
**Crakanthorp calls Archbishop of Spalatro, Judas**, ii. 499  
**Cranmer and Ridley. Their learning**, ii. 328  
**Lebas' and others' estimate of Cranmer**, ii. 322. Which portrait best? Do.  
**Cudworth co-equal with Lightfoot and Buxtorf**, ii. 554

## C.

- Cyprian, convert of Cæcilinus, i. 114  
 Cyprian's relics put in St John's, Lyons, prayer to him, i. 582  
 Cyprian's remains rest at Compiègne, i. 115  
 Cyril of Jerusalem more new doctrine than all before, i. 185  
 Use of Cyril of J.'s and other liturgies in that of Church of England, i. 187  
 Cyril of A. against Chrysostom in council under the oak, i. 389  
 Cyril of Alexandria followed, ii. 709, Goulb.  
 Cyril and Nestorius, antithesis, i. 394
- Damasus, a tribute to Irene (sister), i. 312  
 Damian influenced Gregory VII., ii. 10, 11  
 Real date of *De Cœnâ Domini*, ii. 131  
 The Defensor Pacis more what men call Erastianism, ii. 184  
 Demaus and Froude against More, ii. 270  
 Lamented Demaus and his life of Lati-mer, i. 625 and 627  
 Fire in town of Deutz, ii. 73, 4, Rup.  
 Didymus steadfast to Origen yet honoured by Jerome, i. 281, 282  
 Ps. Dionysius claimed for Paris four centuries later by Hilduin, i. 491  
 Ps. Dionysius for ten centuries dazzled the Church, i. 491  
 Döllinger v. Bishop of Lincoln on Hippolytus, i. 108, 109  
 Döllinger v. Wordsworth, i. 123, Com.  
 Dressel's Prolegomena, and Hefele on the date of the *Pastor of Barnabas*, i. 34  
 Dr Drey's opinion on the real date of the Ps. Ap. Canons, i. 146; others, 140  
 Duns' answer to extreme predestinarianism, ii. 173  
 Duns (Scot) went from Oxford to Paris, ii. 172  
 W. Durand uncle of D. de St Pourcain, i. 165  
 D. de St P. cited by Rohrbacher for Papal Supremacy, ii. 274  
 D. de St P. last not least of great scholastics, ii. 274
- The first printed Eastern Liturgies by Ducas at Rome, i. 353  
 Customs in Eastern Churches, ii. 687  
 Elliott's *Horæ Apoc.* (Ed. IV.) conforms to Mede, ii. 532  
 Emeric de Bonis and St Charles, delay after confession, ii. 563, A. Arn.  
 Ephraim put out Syrian hymns, i. 817

## E.

- Epiphanius calls Origenists *αλεγοριολοις* i. 297  
 Erasmus thought Hausschein on the words, &c., unrivalled, ii. 373  
 Erasmus hard on Augustine, i. 254  
 Erasmus and Luther to be estimated separately, ii. 282, 3  
 Erasmus' paraphrases (Milman says) the great work of the age, ii. 282  
 How scarce Erastus, how little known, ii. 389  
 The way in which after council Vercelli Erigena's MSS. were treated, i. 600  
 Eucherius of Lyons attached to Aug., i. 437  
 Eusebius Em. charged with bias against the Persons, i. 180  
 Eusebius the Church Herodotus, i. 427  
 Euseb. C. objected long to the Nicene word, i. 159  
 Euseb. C. preached in an Arian Council, i. 159  
 Euseb. C. "the father of Church History," i. 159  
 Eustathius. His liturgy, pray Spirit to come down, i. 183, Euseb. Em.  
 Eutych. Const. died of acute fever after Lord's supper, i. 499  
 Eutych. Const. sent to Counc. V., i. 499  
 Evagrius, a lawyer, only inferior as historian to Soc., i. 514  
 Rev. R. W. Evans' idea about missions abroad, i. 60  
 R. W. Evans severe on Origen and favourable to Cyprian, i. 104, Or.
- Pope Fabianus like Ambrose a layman when chosen Bishop, i. 106  
 Facundus fit name for defend. of Theod. M. and Theod. Cyr., i. 489  
 Fisher palliates the king's error, Creative Subst., ii. 302, Bp F.  
 Fox, fellow of Magdalene, Oxford, Earl of Surrey patron, ii. 475  
 Fox and Dean Goode on the meaning of the fathers, ii. 2, 3  
 The three Francis, ii. 139, F. of A. Tuscan poet  
 German reckoning F. of A. greater than Dom., ii. 139  
 All great Franciscans Britons but Bonaventure, ii. 144  
 Bonaventure sick at four: given to S. F., died at 53, gazing on crucifix, ii. 150  
 F. of A.'s Three Rules. Visit to Sultan, ii. 138  
 F. of A.'s stigmata, perhaps fiction of successor, ii. 139  
 Fran. of A.'s Council of the Strawhuts, ii. 137. Dominic there  
 Franciscan and Dominican opinions, ii. 607



## F.

Fred. II.'s court in Sicily favoured Arabic and Greek, ii. 159, T. Aquin.  
 Frith and B. Gilpin preferred by Card. Wolsey to Christ Church, Oxford, ii. 253. Frith refuses to fly  
 Fulg. of Ruspe assailed Cass. in defence of Aug., i. 480

Gaspar Casalius, Brussels 1565, i. 354  
 Gelas. I. in second year had Theodorico (Arian) succeed, i. 475  
 Gelas. Cyz. aided in history Nicæan Council by Dalmatius, i. 472  
 Gennadius, Cyril Lacar, &c., ii. 234  
 Gerbert falls into the error of Eutyches, ii. 8, 9  
 Gerbert first mover of crusading, ii. 6  
 Gerbert's opinion on the body and blood unsettled, ii. 7  
 Gerbert, the philosopher, the first Frenchman a pope, ii. 5  
 Gerbert used the Pseudo-Isidore decretals, ii. 6  
 Germanus of Paris stops war by Sigebert, i. 495  
 Gerson raised the idea of Councils as chief power, ii. 214  
 Dean Goode's idea about the supply of clergy, ii. 695  
 Gorgonia, sister of Greg. Na., her cure, i. 211  
 Gratian's (Papal law) Decree, ii. 95, 6  
 Greg. Thaum., a convert of Origen, i. 83  
 Greg. Agrigent., "a sea of arguments," i. 516  
 Gregory of Nyssa, perhaps leader in Council II., i. 202  
 Grindal born (near Grange-over-sands), Lancashire, ii. 400  
 Guibert alone describes Peter the Hermit, ii. 85; supports Anselm, 86  
 Guizot, triple division of Christian influence, i. 252

Alex. Hales taught Bonaventure: was between old and late schol., ii. 146  
 Bishop Hall, the Christian Seneca, ii. 519  
 Hallam's charge of Bucerianism, ii. 325, Cran.  
 Valuable extract from Hallam, ii. 378  
 £100 offered for Dr Hammond's head, ii. 559  
 Dr Harrison's arguments chiefly with Dr Pusey, ii. 703  
 Dr Harrison's controversy with Dr Jacob, ii. 701  
 Dr Harrison's eight rules to interpret the fathers, ii. 702  
 The seven sisters and their friend De Hauranne, ii. 575

## H.

Hauschein and Zwingel well knew Latin, Greek and Hebrew, ii. 371  
 Hefele on Mohler in Wetzer and Welte, i. 140  
 Hefele's arguments for *Hermas* being possibly brother of Pope Pius I., and comparison with Thomas à Kempis, i. 38  
 Henry VIII., author of book against Luther, Fisher's help, ii. 296  
 Henry VIII. errs by not knowing Greek, ii. 298; need of pomp for people, ii. 300, H. VIII.  
 Hilary's identity of judgment with Nicene council, i. 170  
 Hilary the deacon and the (Ambrosian) com., i. 250  
 Hil. A., dream of robes, i. 426  
 Hippolytus affirms that Christ did not eat *τὸ πρῶτον*, i.e. the Lord's supper, i. 113  
 Marble statue of Hippolytus discovered in Rome 1555, i. 108  
 Honoratus (spiritual) parent of Hilary of Arles, i. 425  
 Hooker's mind a microcosm. Admired by Clement VIII. and Charles I., ii. 452  
 Difference Hooker Taylor and Barrow, Bp Heber and Dr Parr, ii. 575  
 Hooker's last prayer written with a coal, ii. 358  
 Hosius present at Coun. Elvira, i. 143  
 Hospinian would fain prove the fathers all but Zwinglians, ii. 443  
 Hospinian does not quite correctly exhibit Zwing., ii. 439, 440  
 Hugo de St V., praise by Cramer, ii. 93  
 Humbert excommunicated, Pat. Constant. A.D. 1058, ii. 36  
 Humbert inconsistent, ii. 27, Bereng.  
 Humbert's journey to England, ii. 35  
 Why Huss burned, held transubstantiation, ii. 204  
 The Hypotyposes (of Heresies by Clem. A.) lost, i. 60  
 Ignatius, the case of the short and long recensions, i. 24, 55  
 Innocent III. and Gregory VII. twin powers, ii. 123, exculpations  
 Irenæus by protest restrains Victor, bishop of Rome, i. 50  
 Irenæus not much beyond Justin, i. 58, except calling the Spirit to the bread and wine  
 Sources of much in Ps.-Isidor. decretals, ii. 586  
 Isid. Pel.'s style highly praised, Dict. Encyc., i. 454  
 Isidore of Pelusium's influence over Cyr. A., i. 453

## I.

Isid. Sev.'s freedom through distance from Rome, i. 522

The Jansen (of Ypres) friend of De Hauranne, ii. 523

Jer.'s writings against Vigilantius and Jovinian saved their memory, i. 284

Jerome became a Christian at Trèves, i. 284

Jewel's address to Merton at death, ii. 348

Jewel's use of a passage imperfect, i. 350  
The holy things of Jewish temple—supposed fate, i. 467

Jews drank each four large cups. Worse at Purim, ii. 635, Whit.

John of Paris suspected, died at Rome, ii. 180

John Cassian visiting cler. meetings, i. 349

John of Damascus and general feeling ending in Nic. Counc. II. worship of images, i. 549

John Nepos Sylvanus. Wastel's arguments, i. 303

Object attained by presence of Judas, i. 468, Leo I.

Julian discussed with Cæsarius, i. 219

Ken refused to admit Duchess of Portsm. into his house, ii. 632

Ken on Church Catechism. How, &c., I can by no means explain, ii. 633, K. Ivo like Ken. Gallican liberties. Refused furs to the King, ii. 53

How Cranmer wrote the rubric on kneeling, ii. 327, 8

Lactantius, tutor in Constantine's family, i. 127

Lanfranc, noble except to Berengar, ii. 15

Latimer's resigning his post, bold speech and more, ii. 317

Laud at Jerome of P.'s trial, ii. 213

Legend about the Sultan of Cyril's day, i. 304

Leib. mistranslates *avtrivura*, and mis-spells, ii. 647

Leib. tries to prove substance changed, and accidents remain, ii. 647

Dimensions not everything. There is a "moles," ii. 647, Leib.

Leib. says elements not adored: because Divine Presence in them, ii. 648, Leib.

Leib. thinks beyond question fathers believed in a real change, ii. 646

The posthumous works of Leibnitz, ii. 638

Levites sow, reap, make, bake sacred bread (Mal. i.), i. 288, Jer.

## L.

Canon Liddon's part in The Priest to the Altar, 734, 5, Capel

Dr Lightfoot would not leave Talmud for Savoy Conference, ii. 550

Peter Lombard to blame for all, ii. 373, 4

Peter Lombard unintentionally prolongs reign of fathers, ii. 114

Cyril Lucar's present to Charles I., i. 14

Luther and Zwingel took up exposition of Scripture, ii. 270

Lyra and Wessel prepare way for Luther, ii. 188

Maldonat follows Erasmus and Cajetan in giving informal comment., ii. 426, 7

Maldonat said Immaculate Conception a pious opinion only, ii. 427

P. Martyr, how came to England. In erudition Calvin's rival, ii. 361

Queen Mary of Scotland took the sacrament every morning at her own hands in England, ii. 408

Maximus' tongue torn out, but he spoke, i. 532

Rev. Dr Cragg's Mijour, or isles of Lerin, i. 437

Dean Milman had met only four that read T. Aquin., ii. 270

Montanus presided at Council Tol. II., i. 636

Mynoides brought Philosophumena from Greece, 1842, i. 110, Hipp.

Neander puts Rupert with Luther, ii. 68

Neocæsarea fertile of great men in one century, i. 192

We want more of the writings of Nestorius and others, i. 388

Nicephorus Const. held image worship against Constant. Cop., i. 569

Pope Nic. I. fails in East, double success in West, i. 625

The oath Novatian imposed, ii. 199, Nic. Xanth.

W. Ockham restored Nominalism: a great offence, ii. 192

Origenism Philonic rather than Platonic, i. 150

Origen's friend and hasty publisher Ambrosius, i. 104, Or.

Origen's speculations of Judaizing origin, i. 150

Outram in Latin to answer Socinus in same language, ii. 589

Overall taught (in Cat.) remission not by sacraments, i. 232, Amb.

Pagi fixes the date of the Apostolic Const., i. 133

Palladius, a fourth century father, died near Aberdeen, i. 326

## P.

- Pareus looked down on in Germ., not a consubs., ii. 444  
 In Parker's revision Article on Grace dropped, ii. 360, Hoop.  
 Paschasius, fuller statement and reiteration, i. 596  
 Paulinus of Nola unluckily finds relics of Felix, i. 364  
 Alc. joined Paul. of A. against Adoptionists, i. 564  
 Paul of Samosata opposed by Dionysius, i. 130  
 Pelagius writes Com. at the wish of Jerome's Heliad., i. 227  
 Jesuit persecution of all connected with Port Royal, ii. 572  
 Peter's contention with S. M. in the Clementines, i. 132  
 Is Peter Mansour J. of D.? i. 554  
 Peter the Singer refuses Bishopric of Tournay, ii. 112  
 The presence of St Peter at Rome, is it an historic fact? i. 12, 13  
 Philastrius known through serm. Gaud., i. 423  
 Photius like Ambrose was a lay state officer, i. 630  
 Bekker thought Phot. B. P. worth his editing, i. 631  
 Photius called to the helm (as against P. Nic. I.), i. 631  
 Photius raised through orders up to bishop in six days, i. 632  
 A letter of Phot. found by Ang. Mai on a palimpsest, i. 633  
 Migne's Photius first perfect edition, i. 631  
 Picture of times, ii. 268, Sav., Anr. Lib. Cat. Pius IV., and Bellarm., &c., ii. 137  
 Regarding the Polish body of Socin. fathers, ii. 664  
 The three cases Pope v. King in F. and E. on marriages, i. 627  
 Pope Pontianus ratified Origen's orders at Rome, i. 105, Pon.  
 Profession of Greeks at Venice to Card. Claud, ii. 544, Alb.  
 Dr Pusey—that would not use any but Church of England words, ii. 727  
 Dr Pusey's Note S. in his two works on the Real Presence, i. 209  
 Quesnel exiled for defending Gallican liberties, ii. 622  
 Rainolds answered Bell. point by point at Oxford, ii. 463  
 Realist W. of Champ. founds Sch. de St V., ii. 92  
 Abbot of Reichenau left papers on the Bible—aid to Strab., i. 620

## R.

- Was there more of Heaven than of earth in Bishop Reynolds? ii. 545  
 Ridley's examination at Oxford. What is in the cup? i. 347  
 Ritual at Rouen in Cent. XI., ii. 39—41  
 Rohrbacher's panegyric on Bede, i. 548, 549  
 Rohrbacher's version of Council III., i. 300  
 Rufinus and Jerome translating and copying, i. 223  
 Rufinus stood firm for Origen, i. 223, and visited Didymus, i. 224  
 Sandys, probably taught at Furness Abbey School, ii. 402  
 Saravia and Hooker in their last intercourse, ii. 454  
 What did Saravia in the Church of England? ii. 462  
 Scaliger thought Prosper A. the first of his age, i. 450  
 Scholastics useful, with their tens of folios, ii. 159  
 John Scot wrote at desire of Charles the Great and Charles the Bald, ii. 29, Bereng.  
 John Scot, mind like Roger Bacon's, i. 600  
 Was Scot Erigena the John who came to Alfred? ii. 2  
 Sir W. Scott's Grey Brother, i. 106, Pon.  
 A description of the Rev. W. E. Scudamore's chief work, ii. 727  
 On sent. in Book of Sent. condemned by pope, ii. 114  
 Hobart Seymour's idea of widely spreading views, ii. 718  
 The Rev. Orby Shipley quoted by M. Capel, ii. 734  
 Siricius attacks Vigilantius and Jovinian, i. 312, Syl.  
 Sirmond shews Baronius wrong on date of Theophyl. by 200 years, ii. 59  
 Sirmond and Menard's discoveries of the work of Barnabas, i. 35  
 Henry Stephens did not see that the letter to Diognetus not Justin's, i. 31  
 Stillingfleet afraid to controvert Hilary of P., ii. 611  
 Sublapsarians, ii. 433  
 Sulpitius the Christian Sallust writes about Martin, &c., i. 814  
 Tauler disciple of great but eccentric Eckhard, ii. 195, Suso, 196  
 Jeremy Taylor like Coleridge's estimate of St Paul, ii. 576  
 Modern order of Tertiaries—manual. Pange lingua, ii. 143

## T.

- Tertullian partly the Christian Tacitus, i. 67, as Prudentius the Christian Horace, i. 249
- Theod. Mops. master, and Chrys. the model, of Theodore, i. 342
- The very spirit of Church of England in Theodore, &c., i. 399
- Theodorus of Studium refused to remarry emperor, i. 573
- Theodulf as Antoine Arnauld, after conf. delay receipt., i. 580
- Theophilus, i. 50
- Theutberga's case should have saved A. Bullen, i. 625
- Tillotson, son of strict Calvinist, conformed time Charles II., ii. 614
- Timothy Ailurus and Peter Mongus against Bas. Sel., i. 464
- One Timothy denied that it is true body, i. 504, Anast. S.
- Fathers of Toledo edited by an archbishop, 1782, i. 636
- Tostatus, at expense of C. Ximenes, ii. 292
- Turton, equal success against Brougham and Wiseman, ii. 679
- Tyndall's ploughboy prophecy, ii. 246, Erasmus, 247
- Ullmann says Pope Gregory partly Pelagian, i. 227
- Ullmann's Life of Greg. Na., i. 210
- Urban II., Fest. Corpus Christi at highest pitch in Spain, i. 636
- Usher's name properly Neville. Providences, ii. 508
- English edition, Variations of Protestantism, omits long supplem. part, ii. 593

## V.

- The Vatican MS. of Theorian, who tried to unite East and West, i. 577
- Neon et sancti Vedasti patris, i. 566, Alc.
- Victor of A. contradicts St Luke about Judas, i. 442
- Pope Victor rejected Theodotus B. from communion, i. 66
- Gilly's Vigilantius on excess at martyrs' feasts, i. 268, Aug.
- Sharp words of M. de Vitri on Jesuit persecution of Angelique Arnauld, ii. 574
- Greg. Na. and Bas., D. Waddington praises for Greek, i. 210
- Wake coming after Tenison, More, &c. His policy, ii. 654—6
- Wake's remarks upon Zwingel, ii. 657
- Waterland corrected Clark and Hoadley, ii. 670
- Whitby reached 88. Why not high preferment, ii. 634
- Whitgift, when young, refused to go to mass, ii. 404
- Manx fishermen and Bp Wilson's influence, ii. 660
- Wolfgang Musculus bold at time of Augsburg C., ii. 355
- The woman healed of an issue, of Peneas (Cæs. Phil.), i. 633, Phot.
- Wycliff's works, textbook of Huss and Jerome, ii. 201
- Zwingel's views now predominate abroad, ii. 690, Haag, 694, W. and W.
- Portrait and autograph of Zwingel, by Neander, ii. 310
- Zwingel's form of celebration, ii. 441, 2
- Wake's remarks upon Zwingel, ii. 657

## FOURTH INDEX. PASSAGES OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

A copious index has been made, but this reduced form seemed preferable.

- Gen. xxviii. 20, hunc panem, i. 286, Jer.  
 xlix. eyes red with wine, i. 487, Fulg.  
 xlix. and Is. l. aqua et vino mixtum, i. 118, 220, Cyp.  
 xlix. wash in wine, i. 157, Ath.  
 Exod. vii. 1, i. 138, Ps. Clem.  
 xii. the Passover, ii. 168, Euseb. C.  
 xiv. 8, and Heb. vi. vii. (Melch.), i. 166, Euseb. C.  
 xxiv. hoc est testamentum, &c., i. 619, Rab.  
 Lev. vii. 12, Eucharistic sacrifices under law with bread, ii. 590, Outr.  
 vii. 12, oil and blood, i. 488, Fulg.  
 vii. 19, omnis mundus manducabit carnem, i. 417, Zeno  
 ix. 16, why not eaten, i. 89, Or.  
 Num. xxiii. 24, i. 93, Or.  
 Job xxxi. 31, O that had of his flesh! i. 511, Greg. I.  
 Ps. xxiii. Thy inebriating cup, i. 101, Or.  
 xxiii. table, oil, i. 163, Euseb. C.  
 xxiii. prepared a table, i. 629, (Remig.), and oil, 630  
 xxiii. inebriate, ii. 81, B. of Seg.  
 xxiii. 5, spiritali cibo, i. 233, Amb.  
 xxiii. τὸ ποτήριον τὸ μεθύσκον με, i. 402, Theod. C.  
 xxiii. calix inebrians, i. 461, Chrysol.  
 xxvi. I will wash my hands, i. 357, Duc.  
 xxxiv. gustaverunt, &c., i. 224, Ruf.  
 xxxvi. 9, μεθύσθησονται, i. 403, Theod. Cyr.  
 li. then shall they offer, i. 226, Ruf.  
 lxx. sacrifice of praise, i. 378, Cyr. A.  
 xcix. adorete scabellum Ejus, i. 272, Aug.  
 cvi. all meant of Lord's supper, ii. 153, Bonav.  
 cxxxv. 6, Power of God, i. 628, Hink., mutare naturas  
 cxl. i. 119, Cyp.  
 Prov. viii. Come eat, &c., i. 517, Greg. Ag.  
 viii. Wisdom, &c., i. 101, 111, Hip.  
 viii. Wisdom, &c., i. 524, Isid. Sev.  
 viii. ἡ Σοφία, i. 553, Germ. Const.  
 viii. Wisdom, i. 283, Did.  
 Eccles. ii. 25, to eat and to drink, &c., i. 516, Greg. Ag.  
 Cant. v. 1, drink abundantly, i. 203, Greg. Ny.  
 v. 1, Prov. viii. wine a type, i. 232, Amb.  
 Isaiah xix. 19, 20, i. 165, Euseb. C.  
 lxi. sheep to slaughter, i. 357, Duc.  
 lxxv. My servants eat, i. 286, Jer.  
 Jerem. ἐμβάλωμεν ξύλον, i. 166, Euseb. C.  
 Ezek. xiii. 8, pillows (phylacteries), i. 158  
 Dan. viii. 11, 12, jube sacrificium, a continual sacrifice, ii. 320, Hugh L.  
 Hab. ii. just live by faith contrary to doctrine of mass, ii. 308, Augsb. C.  
 Zeph. iii. 19, i. 36, Barnab.  
 Mal. i. 10, 12, σωματικὰς, i. 166, Euseb. C.  
 i. 11, θυσίας, i. 45  
 i. 11, pure θυσίαι of this sect., i. 46, Just.; incense, i. 45, 56, Iren.; i. 305, 306, John of Jer.  
 Matt. vii. 6, not holy to dogs, i. 310, Syl.  
 ix. 15 (Bridegroom), i. 175, Hil. P.  
 xii. blasphemy Holy Spirit, i. 528, Isid. Sev.  
 xii. 6, greater than temple, i. 193, Bas.  
 xiv. 26, lest faint, &c., i. 234, Amb.  
 xxvi. 29, drink no more of fruit of vine, i. 55, Iren.  
 Mark v. 27, touched garment of Christ, i. 458, Chrysol.  
 Luke vii. 6, not worthy that enter, &c., ii. 127  
 viii. 16, Who touched Me? i. 88, Or.

Luke xv. 25, carne quotidie pascimur, cruore potamur, i. 628, Hink.  
 xxii. and John vi. Christ says unbelieving are lost, ii. 141, F. of A.  
 xxii. 16, i. 113, Hip.  
 xxiv. 30, not this sacrament, ii. 407, Fulke  
 John i. 14, i. 110, Hip.  
 iii. and vi. except born, and except eat, i. 476, Gelas. I.  
 v. The flesh, &c., οὐ περὶ τῆς 'Εαυτοῦ σαρκὸς λέγων, i. 348, Chrysost.  
 vi. 62, 3, Dr Schaff's compilation of views, ii. 712, Lange  
 vi. 63, ii. 527, Jansen  
 vi. Chrysostom denies that Christ meant His own body, i. 348  
 vi. Unless ye eat, i. 628, Hink.  
 vi. 61, Bell's reasoning, ii. 481, says about Lord's supper  
 vi. above a year before institut. of sacrament, ii. 514, Usher  
 vi. how connected with Lord's supper, ii. 671, Waterl.  
 vi. the part of the chap. allegorical, ii. 680, Turt.  
 vi. ἀληθῆς used as ἀληθινός, ii. 679 and 680, Turt.  
 vi. 64, i. 93, Or.  
 vi. debateable part is "spiritual," ii. 681, Turt.  
 vi. 51 expounded, i. 518, Ammon.  
 vi. A year before Christ died. How any carnal eating, ii. 513, 514, Usher  
 vi. He speaketh it not of flesh indeed, profiteth not, ii. 348  
 vi. Christ speaks not of sacramental but spiritual eating, ii. 501, Crak.  
 vi. 64, "Apparent Contradictions." i. 689, Jul. Tol.  
 vi. vere, i. 171, Hil. P.  
 vi. 55, 56, ii. 650, Fenelon  
 vi. 56, verum manna non in typo, &c., i. 245, Amb.  
 vi. Cyril's reasoning on, ἡ σὰρξ οὐκ ὠφέλει σῶσθαι, i. 384  
 vi. præsentiā veram et exhibit. agnovi, ii. 388, Buc.  
 vi. spiritual not sacramental feeding, ii. 245, Sylv.  
 vi. Jews imposed a false sense on, ii. 634  
 vi. the eating belongs to all times. Not sacramental, ii. 560, Eckh.  
 vi. Therefore Christ's flesh is not present, ii. 487, Corn. à L.  
 vi. 63, three chief views, ii. 730, Ryle  
 vi. of sacramental eating it is false. True never unprofitable, ii. 634

John vi. He who says not sp. would say any Scr. not sp., ii. 681, Turt.  
 vi. σκανδαλίῃ, i. 156, Ath.  
 xii. 28, v. Matt. xxviii. 20, ii. 89, Guib.  
 xiii. 1. ut transeat, 26 the sop, 71 Judas, i. 621, 622, Strab.  
 xv. 5, manere Se in eo, i. 174, Hil. P.  
 xvi. 28, now I leave the world, &c. explained, ii. 416, Chemn.  
 xviii. 28, Passover means unleaven on next day! ii. 189, Lyra  
 xx. 1, 2, ὥστε, i. 182, Euseb. Emes.  
 xx. 17, Touch me not, explained, ii. 635, Whit.  
 xx. 23, on direction of clergy, i. 523  
 xxi. 9, Beda, i. 295, Jer.  
 Rom. viii. 28, i. 102, Or.  
 xii. reasonable service, i. 345, Chrysost.  
 1 Cor. iv. nihil mihi conscius sum, i. 351, Cass.  
 x. the same spiritual, &c., i. 267, Aug.  
 x. the stone not bodily Christ, ii. 4, Alf.  
 x. same spiritual, i. 290, Jer.  
 x. an idol being nothing, ii. 659, Wake  
 x. umbra in petra, i. 233, Amb.  
 x. argument on, ii. 711, Goulb.  
 x. 1, escam spiritalem, hunc panem significavit, i. 638, Ilde.  
 x. 3, ii. 533, Mede  
 xi. set in order, i. 261, Aug.  
 xi. Have ye not houses, &c.? i. 193, Bas.  
 xi. 23, I received, 26, till He come, i. 622, Strab.  
 xi. eating judgment, i. 193 and 199, Bas., and 203, Greg. Ny.  
 xi. interpretation of ἐνοχος, ii. 728  
 xi. 22, houses to eat, &c., ii. 677, Hoad.  
 xi. facientes eam triclinium epularum, i. 291, Jer.  
 xi. non dijudicat, non discernit, &c., i. 619, Rah.  
 xi. eating unworthily and rest set in order, ii. 92, Hervé  
 xi. not discerning the Lord's body, ii. 815, Zwin.  
 xi. ὁσάκις ἐν φάγῃ, interpreted, ii. 720  
 xi. criticism on, ii. 552, Light.  
 xi. until He come, ii. 20, Lanf.  
 xi. 23, addition to, ii. 219, Gers.  
 xi. 30, i. 95, Or.  
 xi. 22, ii. 61 and 66, and Theoph., ii. 60

- 1 Cor. xi. 20, Eras., i. 563, J. of D., and ii. 285, Eras.  
 xi. 24, ii. 599, M. Guion, and ii. 486, Corn. à Lap.  
 xi. 27—32, i. 316, Pacian
- Gal. iv. 10, 11, observ. of days, i. 86, Or.
- Eph. i. 7, redemption, i. 201, Cyr. J.  
 ii. 6, *συνήγειρε*, i. 87, Or.  
 v. 20, the same flesh and bones, ii. 20, Lanf.  
 v. 30, members body flesh and bones, i. 54, Iren.
- 1 Tim. ii. 1, kinds of prayer, i. 256, Aug.  
 iv. 4, misapplied, ii. 727  
 iv. 5, sanctified, i. 206, Greg. Ny.
- Titus i. 1, i. 293, Jer.  
 ii. to the pure, i. 290, Jer.
- Heb. iv. yet without sin, i. 350, Cass.  
 viii. who serve, &c, i. 346, Chrysost.
- Heb. ix. the Heavenly things themselves, i. 408, Theod. Cyr.  
 ix. 4, offered self, i. 90, Or.  
 x. 1, *una est hæc hostia non multæ*, i. 566, Alo.  
 x. 1, ii. 66, Theoph.
- xiii. 5, we have an altar, i. 408, Theod. Cyr.  
 xiii. 5, *θυσίαν αβέβρωτον*, i. 56, Iren.  
 xiii. 10, not one commentator says Lord's table, ii. 678, Hoad.  
 xiii. 10, Christ a kind of altar, ii. 20, Lanf.
- 1 Pet. ii. 1, i. 62, Clem. A.  
 ii. 9, royal priesthood, i. 201, Cyr. J.  
 ii. who did no sin, i. 350, Cass.  
 iv. 18, i. 220, Cass.
- Rev. v. 8, the incense, i. 56, Iren.  
 xi. 19, the temple, i. 53, Iren.

END OF VOL. II.





